Anti-Slavery Standard Vol. 11-12

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS.

VOL. XII. NO. 5. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1851. WHOLE NO. 577.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & brother, printers.—Thursday, June 26, 1851.

The Southern Press.

THE LAW IN RELATION TO FREE COLORED PERSONS.

WE have never been found counselling opposition to the laws, save in the mode suggested by the laws themselves, or recognized by the constitution, nor shall we ever be. If a law be conceived in a mischievous spirit, or should it militate against the rights of the people, or inpinge in any unfair manner their persons or their property, without infringing the constitution, we shall labor to rescind such law, and to have substituted an equitable enactment in its stead. But so long as it is law, if applied or enforced at all, we shall narrowly watch its operation, and denounce any unfair leaning or partiality in its administration.

The law in relation to free colored persons coming into this State, has never appeared to us reasonable, expedient or wise; or at all calculated to effect any good object, so far as the protection of our slave property extends; for in its application, it has uniformly been one-sided, partial and inefficient. The shipping interest has suffered severely by it in convenience, in time, and in pocket; and the memorial of shipmasters, which we append to this article, addressed to the Legislature in Dec. 1848, eloquently and clearly enumerates the annoyances to which that great interest is exposed from its continuance. Its evil effects are not confined to ship owners alone, for as we have recently witnessed, foreign governments have made it the ground of remonstrance and complaint; and the humiliating spectacle has been presented to the world, of a single State of a confederacy entering into diplomatic negotiations with alien functionaries on matters properly appertaining to federative sovereignty alone.

South Carolina and Louisiana are, we believe, the only States in which a law of this character has found a place; they alone have legislated all free colored, persons whatsoever, coming within their borders, into prison during their sojourn; but in carrying out this enactment in this city, we find that the colored persons from whom the least injury may be expected are the only sufferers, those, namely, who come hither in ships, while the really dangerous, those from the western free States, are comparatively privileged to roam at large, without let or hindrance. It is on this account, mainly, that we regard the law as objectionable, and as furnishing cogent reasons for its repeal.

We are decidedly in favor of such a system of *surveillance* of the free people of color coming hither from adjoining or distant States, or foreign countries as may enable our police to watch their movements and to detect and bring to punishment all those who may in any manner offend against the laws, or incur the imputation of being dangerous and suspicious characters.

We have no doubt but next December, on the meeting of a new legislative body, this subject will be brought forward and receive all the attention one of its gravity truly merits, but until the law be swept from the statute book, and a better one substituted, we shall contend for its equal and impartial application to every individual coming within the reach of its provisions.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, in General Assembly convened—

Your petitioners—American shipmasters—engaged in the commerce of New Orleans, with due deference and respect, represent:

That the present laws relating to free colored persons have an onerous and detrimental effect on us and the interests we represent. We are well aware of the necessity of stringent laws in this matter, and in view of the many and paramount considerations of public welfare which vindicate their enactment, we justify them; but we respectfully pray that your honorable body may give the matter such investigation as may be deemed its due, and make such amendments as shall produce the desired effect of securing the peace and safety of the State, the inviolability of property, and at the same time the prevention of the many evils of which we respectfully complain.

We beg to lay before your honorable body a few examples of the vexations and disadvantages resulting from the present laws, premising, as our excuse for entering a little into detail, that none can appreciate the trials of those "who plow the blue fields of ocean to prepare a harvest for the sickles of commerce," but themselves, and it behooves them to present the hardships they experience under the laws and their prayers for the revision of them, intelligibly to those who, like your honorable body, have the power to remedy and relieve.

1. We recognise the distinction between the whites and blacks, which places the latter in the line of servile employments. A colored man fits himself for the capacity of cook or steward; his ambition limited to the highest excellence in that vocation and his innate fear and respect for the commander and officers of the ship, because of the superiority of their race, make him, to a very laudible degree, skilful, faithful and obedient; whereas, under the present laws not only are we obliged to ship white men utterly unfit for the peculiar duties of cooks and stewards, at very high wages, but in those capacities they often have us completely under their control, setting examples of insubordination, weakening and even subverting our authority. The manner of this would be tedious of explanation. It is well known and understood by your petitioners, as well as all nauticle men. Moreover, a white man in such a menial capacity generally looses the pride, dignity and integrity, which characterize our race, and therefore it is easy to perceive that besides being careless of our advantage and welfare and of all else but self, he is often tempted to form leagues with bad men on shore for the robbery of his ship, for which free ingress and egress give him ample opportunity. This, we are convinced, has often happened; indeed, we could cite instances, and would do so but for fear of wearying your patience. These evils, your petitioners respectfully think, would be avoided if we are allowed to bring our long tried colored servants, whom we have in complete subordination, and who would be confined to our ships.

2. Upon our arrival in this port, white cooks and stewards are tempted by higher wages to leave us and go on the rivers. This, or the incarceration of the blacks, if we bring them, compels us to hire unknown persons, who often abuse their trusts either by stealing or affording facilities for others to do so. Besides, as we have no control over them, they are often eye servants, extravagant, insolent, likely to leave undone many of those duties our own servants are accustomed to perform, and they often leave us at the most important junctions. We often have colored cooks and stewards, whom from a trial of years, we find capable of superintending fully one department of the ship's economy, thus relieving ourselves from much trouble. Hence our hardships are much enhanced by our being obliged to give up these experienced and faithful servants for those we know nothing of.

3. Besides the disadvantages we have thus alluded to, there are others which seriously affect the whole shipping interest engaged in the New Orleans trade. For instance, employing white men as cooks and stewards, abstracts so many from the aggregate number of seamen employed in the commerce of this port. Suppose 1000 vessels, each carrying a cook and steward, to visit this harbor in a year, 2000 men would be taken from the totality required to man these ships, to fill the capacities of cook and steward, and consequently leave unmanned 142 of them. This is hypothetical, but we believe it to come short of statistical facts, which are now existant, but which we have neither time nor opportunity to collect.—Hence it results that sailors are difficult to get, and wages much enhanced. Last year many ships to our certain knowledge were, after they were ready for sea, detained from eighteen to twenty days, waiting for ships to come in, from which, by high bounties, they could obtain crews—for Jack must be highly paid to give up his customary cruise on shore. Enormous wages were exacted by the landlords, and as high has fifty dollars blood-money—as it is called—was often paid to them for the privilege of shipping the sailors whom they could control. Suppose a ship to require sixteen hands, here would be an absolute loss of $800, for sailors get their regular wages besides. These things will inevitably take place again this year. There are now eighty full-rigged ships in port, all requiring crews. There are few, very few sailors, in consequence of the above abstraction, and their going on the rivers. Sailors' wages are now $18 per month for a voyage to Liverpool or Havre, with $30 advance money. The voyage can be made in thirty days. Jack invariably runs away in Liverpool, and it is with that in view that he stipulates for the $30 advance money. Now what is the effect on a single ship, one carrying sixteen hands, for instance? Why, an absolute loss to the ship of $192 in a single month. So much for the abstraction of white seafaring men from their proper vocation.

4. Another great detriment and positive loss arises from our servants being taken from us and imprisoned. We pass over the constant and harassing care and anxiety, and the apprehension of being robbed, which we experience from employing unknown substitutes to our known, capable and faithful servants. A ship pays $30 per month for the prison board of her cook and steward; $40 per month for their wages, receiving nothing in return; and $30 per month for a substitute, making a positive loss of $100 per month for all the time she lies in port, which is sometimes from two to four months. The aggregate of these absolute and inevitable losses, is often equivalent to the profits of the ship; and as they are not the legitimate results of a healthy commerce, regulated by proper laws—not caused by revulsions in the momentary affairs of the country, which of course we can neither avoid nor complain of—not in consequence of any wrong done by us—not productive of good to any class, but are the results of legislation which was not intended to produce such detriment, and which, in our humble opinion, may be so revised as to produce the effect for which it was designed, to wit: the peace and safety of the community, and at the same time not injure us; we most respectfully complain of them to your honorable body, and pray for their prevention.

This is a representation of but few of the evils we have experienced under the present laws. Of the vast number of vessels which visit this port, none escape detriment from the above causes. Moreover, we are convinced that of the great number of persons who are required in lieu of imprisoned servants, the only design of many is to get prey. This your honorable body may find to be the cause of the many thefts and robberies on board of ships in this port, of which the journals give daily account.

In conclusion, having the utmost confidence in your honorable body's wisdom and justice, we will not venture to suggest any remedial legislation which would be as foreign to us as nauticle matters would be to your honorable body.

Thinking that if any class of men should be heard by your honorable body and have their grievances remedied, it is your petitioners, who contribute so largely to enhance the prosperity, wealth and greatness of your noble State—risk their lives on the ocean—

> "And fight in the wild midnight
> With the storm on the mountain wave,"

for the advancement of commerce, civilization and the welfare of mankind, and hoping that your honorable body will give due consideration to the subject matter of our memerial, and as far as compatible with the dignity and welfare of the State of Louisiana, grant our prayer. Your petitioners conclude by expressing the most profound respect for your honorable body. And for the above relief, as in duty bound, they will ever pray.

Signed by nearly all the Shipmasters in port.—*The (N. O., La.) Daily True Delta.*

THE FAULTS OF THE COMPROMISE.

THE views we have expressed, from time to time, in this paper, on the value of the compromise as a means of promoting the peace of the country, have elicited some very sharp comments from its adversaries. They are not indeed new to us; for the same style of attack upon these measures, and their friends, is in vogue at the North, among the anti-compromisers of the Abolition stripe. The N. Y. *Tribune* and the N. Y. *Evening Post* employ the same weapons of ridicule and offence, and exhibit the same lack of good temper and good logic in assailing the compromise there, as are displayed, with perhaps a little more flippant levity of manner, by those who undertake to supervise, criticise and condemn the course of the *Picayune*. We meet nothing, therefore, in this demonstration, that we have not seen often before in Abolition and Secession journals; but our readers may not all be aware of the extravagant assumptions upon which these antagonists agree, in order to prostrate the efforts of those who are laboring for peace and union. We may, therefore, afford a few words in summing up the case, as these parties sometimes make it.

In the first place, there is the flat denial that any thing in the state of the country, at the time when the compromise measures were brought forward, called for such a movement. There was no real danger, and no serious alarm. The agitation was comparatively slight, until the compromise created it. There was neither Abolitionism nor Disunionism in the country, or serious danger of either, until the compromise begat them.

It is admitted, indeed, that there was some little excitement in the North for the Wilmot Proviso, and the exclusion of Slavery, by law from the Territories; in the South against them. But there was nothing in either to produce a conflict which needed compromise—or ought to be compromised—or would have disturbed the harmony of the States or the peace of the Union. We were in a condition of comparative quiet, when some evil-minded, or very ill-judging persons, fancied the country in danger, and brought out this hateful compromise to disturb a happy people. It undertook to settle diffculties where none existed—and it made many. It generated monsters that it cannot master. All the discords that distract us are of that baleful origin.—Free-soilism so harmless before sprang up into a mighty influence and power. Disunionism, which had never been hinted at, or prophecied, or threatened before, was suddenly born a giant. Of all these evils and portents of evil, the real and guilty authors are Clay, Cass, Fillmore, Webster, Cobb, and the other statesmen and political leaders who abused the public confidence by taking counsel of their own fears, exaggerating State perils, and providing State remedies, until they drove the bashful and unwilling Sewards and Rantouls into open Anti-Slavery coalitions, and instilled the posion of secessionism into the innocent minds of the quiet Quitmans and reluctant Rhetts.

This is a fair and by no means exaggerated statement of a favorite position of the anti-compromisers North and South. They are the real Union and the real peace men; and they maintain the claim with a complacent gravity of pretension as though it were an insult to doubt. Yet, we take the freedom to say that there is not a man of sound mind, with sufficient intelligence to recollect what he knew and felt twelve months ago, who does not know that, in that assumption, scarcely a fact is fairly stated, or an inference drawn with candor.

There was deep excitement, and widespread and well-founded alarm. Vehement passions had been aroused into dangerous activity. They had already arrayed section against section, and continued to grow in intensity and bitterness. Day by day the North and South were brought into more frequent collision and becoming more irreconciliably alienated. There was—or else these papers which make light of the value of the compromise have been making false representations for years against the North—a Free Soil influence pervading the free States, controlling not only a peculiar party, but directing the political action of both of the great parties of the North. If there was no free soilism but the third faction of the Van Burens, till the compromise made it, the South has been most wantonly deceived, for her leading men have been warning her for years against the rapid spread of the prevalence of that taint, and pointing to the legislative declarations and instructions in favor of the restriction upon Slavery in the Territories, which at one time made the whole North seem a unit in Congress in favor of the Free Soil heresy. There were, too, if history does not lie, and if any meaning is to be attached to the resolutions of Southern Legislatures to the proclaimed purpose of one Southern State, and the voice of sundry imposing conventions, a fixed purpose never to yield to the demands of the North, but to resist at all hazards, even to the dissolution of the Government. With parties thus sectionally arrayed in conflict, and thus resolute in their declared purposes, it was impossible not to apprehend evil from the continued strife.

It is impossible to suppose that without a change of position and feeling the excitement would not have gone on increasing—that these passions would not become more exasperated and vindictive, the conflict more fierce and uncompromising, and the danger of disunion, with all its horrors, more imminent if not inevitable. If such effects did not follow, in fact, it is simply because this abuse of compromise interposed and changed the direction and broke the force of the currents that were driving the contending parties on to a certain collision. It was to the power of the compromise alone that its enemies owe the ungracious privilege of being able to deny the fatal consequences to which their own policy was hurrying the country. It broke up the array of hostile sections before they had joined battle in a fratricidal warfare. If it did not disperse the combatants intirely, or blend them altogether at once into a harmonious brotherhood again, it deprived the quarrel of much of its bitterness, brought distant parties into friendly communion to repress the disorderly movements of late allies as well as late opponents, and afforded a firm basis upon which all may gather together, without prejudice, disgrace or loss.

That it was proposed and carried by a union of sentiment among public men of all sections and parties—that it has been accepted by large masses of the people in nearly every State, constituting, as we firmly believe, three-fifths or more of the people of the Union—and that it is assailed by and maintained against the violence which threatens and the madness which provokes disunion, is sufficient to prove that it is a Union measure in its design and in its effects, and to expose to well-deserved ridicule the pretence that it made the abolitionism or the disunionism which it only unmasks to the light of the day.

We are probably wasting words upon the exposure of such palpable nonsense. The disunionism which is developed in a revolt against the compromise, was deeply in the system before the compromise existed: a disease which needed but slight stimulus to force itself into activity. There is some hope, now that it discloses herself, a healthy action may expel it altogether, and restore the body to its natural soundness. The compromise may be, in this way, the salutary cause of removing the disease, while undergoing the reproach of having produced it. We are not shaken in our faith that its power will spread, and prove beneficent, and continue to furnish antidotes to the poisonous influences of ultraisms of all kinds.—*N. O. Picayune.*

A SLAVEHOLDER AT THE NORTH.

WE have been allowed the privilege of making the following extracts from a private letter to a friend, written by a gentleman, formerly a resident of this city, but at present residing in a Northern State, of which he is a native. We give the extracts with a view to show the state of feeling that exists at the North on the Slavery question, and as exhibiting an instance beautifully illustrative of one feature of our much abused institution. The writer is a Northern man, and is residing at his ease in a free State, where he is refused communion in the church to which he belongs because he is a slaveholder; and yet he is too good a master to forget his faithful slave, who, in his old age may require his support and protection. How few of the ministers of —— the church of whom he speaks, would imitate his example in providing for the comfort of those who had spent their youth in their services!

In regard to the rumor that Mr. POTTER, the owner of Sims, sent him on to Boston for the purpose of testing the law, we feel authorised, from conversations which we have previously had with Mr. P., to give it a flat contradiction. It is very true that Mr. POTTER cared very little for the loss of the slave, but he felt that it was his duty to prosecute his rights, and in doing so he was actuated purely by a desire to vindicate and test the rights of the South under the Fugitive Law. The letter from which we extract is dated

"BOSTON, April 17, 1851.

"I left New York for this place, and have put up at the 'Adams House' here. I have been introduced to Gov. Boutwell, and some members of his council, with the Secretary of State &c., &c., consequently, as you may suppose, have had much conversation. The Governor told me there was an intense feeling in all the country towns on the subject of letting Sims (the negro slave of James Potter,) be carried off into Slavery. I told him I knew Mr. Potter well; that I did not believe he cared much about the man, but was determined to try the question, and see whether a slave could be carried back. It is commonly reported, but few believe it, that Mr. Potter sent the man on for the purpose of trying the question. I hope such was the case, but I doubt it. Should such prove to be the case, it would grieve the Abolitionists wofully. Now I think of it, my old negro man Bob called on me three times while I was in Savannah, said he was growing old, and might be sick and require assistance, and I should be absent. I told him to call on or send to you—should he do so, give him such aid as you think he may need, and charge to me. Mr. —— —— goes that way frequently; if you would ask him to make inquiries concerning him, and let you know, I would be obliged to you."

* * * * * * * * *

"It is surprising what a hold this 'Slavery question' is taking on the feelings of the people this way. The ministers of—I was going to say the Gospel—the Churches are doing all in their power to create feelings hostile to the Constitution and the South, and the women are following their example. 'What cannot priests and women do?' said a great French philosopher. We see what they *can* do."—*Savannah (Ga.) News.*

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.

WE have been politely furnished by a friend with a catalogue of the Officers, Trustees and Students of our University; and in the Senior and Graduating classes we notice the names of Geo. G. Beeman and Joseph P. Wier, of Miss.; Wm. P. Carter, of Rutler; Guy S. Goldsby, of Dallas; Jonathan Haralson, of Lowndes, Thomas H. Lewis, of Benton; Eliphalet A. McWhorter, of Montgomery; Edward L. Stickney, of Greene; and Wm. S. Wyman, of Montgomery. We look forward with bright hopes and the fondest anticipations when these young men will be an honor to themselves, their State, their fathers and mothers, and show by their acts, their talents and oratory, that the University of our own State is equal to any in the world.

> "Honor and fame from no condition rise,
> Act well your part, there all the honor lies."

We have long since been a warm advocate for Southern Colleges, Southern Institutions, and Southern education. Why go to the North to educate your son or your daughter? The Faculty of the Alabama University is one that will vie with any, and suffer not in comparison with any in the other States. We do not recollect any remarkable degree of intellect or superiority of those who graduate North or south of Mason and Dixon's line—if any, the Southerner has the advantage.

Who are the best friends to their country, those who remain here and encourage Southern trade and Southern institutions, or those who go North to be accomplished? The University at Tuscaloosa is the only College in our State, and she has but nine students in the graduating class. Will the patriots, the people of Alabama let her fade away and fall into mouldering ruins? What a commentary this must be upon every father, mother, yea, all who are forsaking the interests of our own University? We feel that the day is not far distant when she will rise, *Phænix-like*, and assume that proud station with other Colleges which is her due and final destiny. We have great confidence in the present graduating class, when they will have left the halls of their *Alma Mater* and enter upon the broad arena of life, assuming new duties and responsibilities, that they will be her firmest and warmest friends, and plead her cause with an ability that will stir up every lukewarm Alabamian to a proper sense of duty.—*Journal.*

NORTHERN TESTIMONY.

Mr. Stimson of *The Day Book* it is well known (says the *S. C. Telegraph*) is now on a tour through the Southern States, and is writing letters to his journal. Like other travellers, who go through a country by express, and attempt to describe the character of the inhabitants, he falls occasionally into strange mistakes, but it is always interesting to read the views and opinions of a stranger, and to see how our habits and institutions are judged by one not accustomed to them. The following extract from a letter written by him from Macon (Ga.) will give his views on the comparative morality of the North and South—a favorite theme with Abolitionists:

I am not going into the statistics of crime, but simply to state what my eyes have seen and my ears heard, or rather what they have not seen and heard, as well as what is very well known and admitted. I have been in the slaveholding States a little over a month. I have travelled nearly two thousand miles by railroads and steamboats, have staid all night and a great many days at hotels. I have been in bar rooms, in drinking saloons, in groceries, in bowling and billiard rooms, on plantations, and in private houses of the master and the slave, and I have not seen one solitary individual drunk or intoxicated. I do not think that I ever travelled a hundred miles in New York without seeing a drunkard. I have not heard from one of the laboring people an oath. I have not seen a quarrel or a fight—in short, I have seen nothing to indicate that the people were not only strictly moral, but religious. As for profanity, I think that there is not one quarter as much even among gentlemen as among us. In reality, if I hear a man swearing a good deal, I have come to look upon him as a "fellow citizen," and am pretty sure to find him a Northerner. The Sabbath is regarded much more here than with us, and religion more respected and revered.

Let us now look at the public men of the two sections, and I must say that I refer to this comparison with mortification and shame. Since I have been old enough to read and observe the course of public characters, New York has sent to Congress habitual drunkards, bankrupts, swindlers, forgers, public defaulters, and I think in one instance a common thief. She has sent to her State legislature, common rowdies, blacklegs, gamblers, debauchees and drunkards. Her representatives and legislators are notoriously immoral and disreputable men. Not all, of course, but a good share of them The abolition districts between Albany and Buffalo have done the worst, but all have been bad enough. Her office seekers have been greater in number than all the States south of her put together, her defaulters more numerous, and her office holders worse men than anywhere in the Union. She has had more government patronage and done more government swindling than all the Southern States put together. Yet amid it all and with all, her chief demagogue and head devil gets up in the Senate and preaches to others upon their obligations to a "higher law." I suppose the fact will be got over some how or some way by the devil's imps, but I should like to see them try it.

Now turn to South Carolina or Georgia; where do you find a man notoriously immoral elected to any responsible or honorable office? Such a thing has never been known. On the contrary, a man whose private character in South Carolina is not above reproach, cannot be elected to office. They are quick and impetuous and ready to resent an injury or an insult with the sword, but there is none of that underhanded, sly, calculating, treacherous, assassin-like way of creeping around and taking advantage of a man's confidence to stab him, nor of the pick-pocket plan of waiting for a "good chance" to rob him. If we turn from their public men to those in the ordinary walks of life, the comparison is quite as much in their favor. One example is enough for my purpose. In the city of Columbia, S. C., you can go at any time of night to the public market and find meat hanging in all the butcher's stalls entirely unprotected by dogs, watchmen or locks. One might take a steak or a roasting piece or a whole quarter of beef and carry it off and the owner would be none the wiser. But it is not done. The negroes are not allowed to be out after nine o'clock, and white folks don't steal. They respect not only the higher but the lower law. Dare Governor Seward's pious followers, Goss and Sartwell for instance, trust their property in Auburn in that way unguarded after nightfall? If they dare, *their* neighbors dare not. As for burglary, larceny, robbery, forgery and other state offences, they are almost unknown here; there is not one to a hundred in New York. How then in the face of these facts can it be said that Slavery has an immoral tendency? I have not locked my trunk, for I have lost the key, or my room door since I have been here. I have slept in a room at a hotel with gentlemen who have laid their gold watches on the mantle shelf, and hung their coats with hundreds of dollars in the pockets on the chairs and gone to bed without ever shutting the door. A feeling of confidence and security exists which I have never seen before in any comunity.

FANATICISM.

READ the following resolutions passed in Wisconsin, at the Anniversary of the Sabbath School Union, for that State. What should be done with such a set of fanatics, who are teaching the youth of the State to disregard the laws of their country? Are such men actuated, and governed by the true spirit of christianity? As for our part, we look upon them as men capable of comitting any crime, blinded by fanaticism and folly. The teaching of youth to disregard the laws of their country, is nothing more or less than *treason* and is utterly at variance with the spirit of benevolence and love taught by our Saviour. There is nothing in the lids of the Bible that teaches any sueh principles, and any man or set of men who teach such doctrines, are enemies to *God* and to their country, and are paving the way for pulling down upon their own heads, and the youth of our country, swift destruction. Read.—*Fort Smith (Ark.) Herald.*

WISCONSIN SABBATH SCHOOL UNION.—At the Fifth Anniversary of the Wisconsin Sabbath School Union at Waukesha, February 18, W. H. Byron, President, and Rev. W. L. Parsons, Secretary, the following resolutions, after a discussion by several of the Clergymen and Sabbath School Teachers, were adopted:

1. Resolved, That the highest law is God's law.
2. Resolved, That all human law that contravenes or comes in conflict with that law is wrong.
3. Resolved, That the late Fugitive Slave Law is in contravention of God's law and that the youth of this State ought so to be taught.

Hon. E. D. Holton introduced these resolves.

NORTHERN CONSERVATISM.

THE Constitutional Unionists in Georgia talk much of Northern conservatism and unionism, and no words are too honied in which to praise the sublime patriotism of the model Unionists. Mr. Webster is confessedly their leader—the very incarnation of patriotism—and his advocacy of the Compromise is considered, in itself, evidence that it is, as Mr. Cobb declares it, "WISE, LIBERAL AND JUST."

It would abate somewhat of the pretensions of Mr. Webster to be a counseller and guide to Southern men, if the Compromise presses in Georgia would publish his speeches in which his real views on Slavery, and his views of confining and cramping the slave power are freely given. They will be found in his Buffalo speech. But we have seen no where in the Compromise press of Georgia a word of denunciation or of dissent to the Abolition sentiments of the speech—nor do we remember even to have seen those portions of that most obnoxious speech in their columns.

The *Anti-Slavery Standard*, however, the organ of the Abolitionists, publishes the speech in full. The Abolitionists evidently find comfort in that speech, especially in that sentence which says—

"Gentlemen, I regret extremely that Slavery exists in the Southern States, and that Congress has not the power to act upon it. But it may be, in the dispensation of Providence, that some remedy may be found for it."

"Who knows how soon the Abolitionists and such model Union compromise men as Mr. Webster—yea, the great Daniel himself—may be lovingly concocting some plan by which Congress may be enabled to act upon it? "*Where there is a will, there is a way.*" At least, Anti-Slavery ingenuity and latitudinarian federalism, are not often at a loss for modes of giving powers to Congress not dreamed of in the school of strict construction.

The declaration put forth by Mr. Webster, on the part of the North, that no new slave States shall ever be admitted into the Union, is another signifi cant sign. It is another one of the fruits of Southern submissionism to the Compromise.

Mr. Webster has seen the South robbed of all the territory, and that she has submitted to it—and sees a party among us, denouncing as traitors, all in the South who raise a voice of remonstrance to it. Well may he feel emboldened, now, to speak of the future, as well as of the past, and declare that never, hereafter, are the Southern people to have a share in any territory beyond that they now hold.

Yet, as Mr. Webster, too, like Mr. Howell Cobb, is a Compromise man, and a Union man, it is, we presume, considered by the Georgia Compromisers, impolitic to object to his opinions. So far from it, those who would warn the people of the tendency of this sort of Constitutional Unionism, are to be overwhelmed with abuse, and Daniel—the God-like—commended to their admiration. He has been even talked of as their next candidate for the Presidency. *Augusta (Ga.) Constitutionalist.*

Selections.

THE condition of this island, and the circumstances under which the emancipation of the mass of its inhabitants from Slavery took place, are as different from those which existed at the period of the advent of freedom in Hayti as a condition or as circumstances can be. The men, the women, and the children who retired to rest on the night of the 31st July, 1934,—the property of man—the human chattels—part of the personal estate of their masters and mistresses—rose on the morning of the 1st of August free men, and free denizens of England. The change—the great and important change—was peaceful and quiet. No brawl occurred—no disturbance was created—no injury was done—no blood was shed—no ill-feelings were exhibited—no law was violated. It was the legal—the joyful transmutation of the pieces of property into the human being—the acknowledgment that the negro was a man! and a brother!! Joy and gratitude overcame every other feeling, and the wrongs and sufferings of Slavery appeared, as if by common consent, to be buried in the grave of that accursed system. The sun shone with more than ordinary brilliancy on the day of liberty in Jamaica, and the stillness of the morn was only broken by the distant peals which ever and anon sounded from the bells of the places of worship summoning the newly-made free man to offer up the praises of a warm and grateful heart to a benignant Providence for the great boon that had been bestowed. Who that reads the accounts of the proceedings in St Domingo—of the cruelties, the recitals of which curdle the blood within us—connected with the emancipation of the people of that island, and compares those proceedings with what was witnessed here, can fail to be struck with the vast difference between the two, and the opposite results to which they promised to lead, and to which they have led. To the peaceful character of our people all bear witness; and if ever the people lose that charecter, it will be because they have been goaded by injustice and wrong into dissatisfaction and disregard for the laws and the authorities. Everything hitherto has been favorable to the spread of correct views and feelings, and there has been nothing to prevent the gradual improvement of the people and the country, save and except those unseemly and unwise measures which for a considerable period of time were persisted in by those whose duty it was to set a good example to the masses. After many years of freedom, Hayti presents a spectacle of anarchy and disunion which every good man must deplore. We have not numbered as many years of liberty as she has, and no one will venture to predict what the condition of Jamaica will be ten or twelve years hence. One fact is patent, however; and it is so important as to induce us to call attention to it. *Nothing effectual is being done by the Legislature to instruct the people, or to prepare them for self-government.* If ever the condition of Jamaica is assimilated to the present condition of Hayti, it will be in consequence of this neglect and inattention of those in authority to educational and religious wants of the people. We repeat, nothing is being done for them. No means are being taken to instruct them in their duties as citizens, or to preserve them from the baneful influences which are at work, and which threaten to undermine and to destroy all public virtue. If ever the condition of Jamaica is assimilated to the present condition of Hayti, it will be because all that the upper classes appear to care about is the procuring of a sufficient quantity of labor for the cultivation of the plantations, at rates of hire which must ever compel the laborers to depend principally upon their own cultivation for the means of maintaining themselves and their families, and consequently to be independent of money wages. The people of Hayti, in so far as ease, or indolence, or exemption from labor, is concerned, were or have been as well off as those of Jamaica. They cultivated their provisions, and reared their small stock, and grew coffee, tobacco, and other articles. The people of Jamaica, have been, and are doing the same thing. With the exception of tobacco, the articles grown, and the animals reared, in the two islands are the same; and the mode of living is very nearly the same. The people of Hayti were left to themselves to procure education as they best could. Nobody cared for them, nobody taught them. The mode of cultivation at present is the mode which was pursued when that island was a colony of France. In these respects there is a striking similarity between them and us. It is a similarity to which we feel ourselves called upon to draw attention. The Government of Hayti left the people to themselves. It took no measures for their instruction in any way whatever, and the consequence is, that they are at the present moment as uninstructed, and, to all intents and purposes, as unfit for self-government as they were when they declared themselves independent of the Mother country. To their ignorance and inability to manage their own affairs must be attributed the present condition of the island. Will the same cause not produce similar effects here? If our Government continue to neglect our people—if the same inattention be exhibited, will they not be in the same condition of unfitness as the Haytians now are at the most distant period we can name? And it has been more than once hinted that Jamaica will have her Soulouque. If so (although we doubt the truth of the prediction), who will be to blame? It is not by enacting disqualifying laws, or increasing the franchise, or throwing difficulties in the way of the enjoyment of civil rights, that we will keep matters in their proper train for the present, or prevent evil by-and-by. The ignorance of the mass is the great evil to be feared. There is danger in it—danger in the present and for the future. It has ruined Hayti. It will ruin Jamaica. There is time to remove it if proper efforts are made; we sincerely hope they will be made.—*The Morning (Kingston, Jamaica,) Journal.*

SLAVERY IN RHODE ISLAND.

[*From an Address delivered before the Rhode Island Historical Society by the Hon.* ELISHA R. POTTER.]

As buying and selling into Slavery was a common practice in the early history of the New England colonies, it is probable that a few slaves might have been found here very soon after our first settlement. We find an act passed to prohibit their purchase as early as 1652; but as the colony was then divided against itself, as well as contending against its neighbors, it probably was not enforced. At any rate, we find that just before the revolution, about one hundred years afterwards, the colony contained about four thousand negroes, most of them probably slaves.

For the early introduction of negro Slavery, the colonies themselves were perhaps little to blame. As with persecution, the spirit of the age was in favor of it. Royalists and republicans had sold each other as slaves into the colonies.*

The English government, partly from political and partly from commercial views, encouraged the traffic in negroes: they made the acquisition and protection of it the subject of foreign negotiation and to the English people (at home) belonged the greater part of this commerce and the enormous profit of it. A French traveller, (Brissot,) remarks, that the English made the greatest profit from the trade, because they treated their slaves worse, and therefore could afford to sell them cheaper.

Although doubts were early entertained of the legality of Slavery in England, the benefit of those doubts were never extended to the colonies. Chief Justice Holt had given his opinion that a negro could not be held as a slave in England, although a white man might be a villain, which was nearly the same.†

In 1696, the question was agitated but not decided, whether baptism made a slave free; (5 Modern Rep.) but in 1729, the Attorney General and Solicitor General of England, to quiet apprehension in the colonies, gave their legal opinion in favor of Slavery on both these questions, (Clarkson 65), and it was not until 1772, just before the termination of their rule over us, that in that magnificent burst of English philanthropy in the case of James Somerset, a colonial slave who had been brought into England, the world was surprised by a judicial decision, that Slavery would not exist in England—that the slave from the colonies became a free man as soon as he stood upon British soil—Cheap justice,—costing nothing to the doers of it: a great display of generosity at the expense of others.

Public opinion in the colonies was probably at first against the introduction of slaves; at least it was so in Rhode Island, so far as we may judge from our laws; but the weakness of the government opposed few obstacles to the cupidity of individuals, and in course of time, it grew to be an interest of itself, influencing, but never in this State absolutely controlling the government.

Much of the early opposition in New England, however, was not to Slavery as such, but only to some particular mode of it.

As in Europe, Christians early ceased the practice of enslaving each other, and the practice of selling one's own children was early abolished, but still conscience and interest went together in enslaving Moors and Blackamoors; so in New England, a similar compromise of conscience took place, but in a different direction. Many people in Massachusetts declared themselves against kidnapping and stealing negroes from Africa. The injustice of this they could see. But Indians met with no mercy. Mr. Mede had given his opinion that they were descendants of the devil; and father Hubbard, in considering the question of the manner in which America was peopled, remarks, that "Mr. Mede's opinion * * * carries the greatest probability of truth."‡ The Massachusetts authorities sold their captives taken in war as slaves; and this not only to people at home, where a Christian community would watch over and protect them, but numbers were sold away to Bermuda and other slave colonies.

Heretics also were sometimes thought fit subjects for Slavery. In Massachusetts, in May 1659, Daniel and Provided Southwick, children of Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick, were sentenced to a fine for the crime of siding with the Quakers—and if they did not pay the fine, to be *sold* into Barbadoes or Virginia. And the sentence was not caried into effect, only because no shipmaster could be induced to take them.§

In Rhode Island, probably from the effect of the recollection of the hospitality with which the Indians had received our ancestors, when fleeing from the presence of men calling themselves Christians, the feeling was different. This colony sold no Indian slaves. In the great war of 1676, they apprenticed some captives for a term of years, but by law prohibited enslaving them; and in 1715, another act was passed to prevent Indian slaves from being brought into the Colony.

The slaves therefore in Rhode Island were negroes. But slave labor was nearly confined to the towns along the Narraganset Bay—Newport, Portsmouth, South Kingstown, North Kingstown, Exeter, Warwick, Bristol and Jamestown. South Kingstown had the greatest number next to Newport.

All along the belt of land adjoining the west side of the Bay, the country, generally productive, was owned in large plantations by wealthy proprietors, who resided on and cultivated their land. They had the cultivation which would naturally result from a life of leisure, from intercourse with each other, and with the best informed men of the Colony, and from the possession of private libraries, for that day, large and extensive. But any *common* system of education they could not have, from their very situation and distance from each other.

In the interior and westernmost portions of the State, the population was scattered, the roads and means of communication poor, and the people themselves enjoying but few of the comforts and luxuries of life. There were no towns, and but few villages, to serve as centres of communication and information, and to set an example to the rest of the community: for nearly all the villages in the western part of the State are of recent growth, and the result of manufacturing industry. Their only opportunities of adding to their knowledge were their religious meetings, their town meetings, and the country courts.

Considered merely in the light of political economy, Slavery has been injurious to the welfare of the State, and has retarded the progress of its people in wealth as well as in knowledge. Its effect upon the families of the proprietors was most disastrous. From the nature of our climate, the expense of supporting slaves was greater than in more southern latitudes: and public opinion would not sanction over-work or ill treatment. The children of their owners were brought up in leisure, with little acquaintance with any profession or business, and when, in the course of time, Slavery was abolished, and they were brought into contact with men educated to labor and to self-dependence, the habits they had acquired from Slavery proved the ruin of most of them; and their property was encumbered, and passed into other hands.

The equal division of property upon the death of the parent contributed to the breaking up of these large plantations, and probably contributed also to the abolition of Slavery itself. Until 1770, just before the Revolution, the eldest son inherited by law the whole estate of a person dying without a will; and after that time, until 1792, he was entitled to a double portion. But public opinion and the common sense of right were stronger than the law; and except in a very few cases, property was generally equally divided by will. And so strong was this feeling, that in many cases where the eldest son, for want of a will, became entitled to the whole, he voluntarily gave up his regal rights, and admitted the other children to a share in the estate. The abolition of Slavery was gradual. In 1774, the importation of slaves was prohibited, and every slave brought into the colony was declared free. Large numbers of them joined our revolutionary army, and were declared free on enlisting. And they were among the best of the American troops, and rendered efficient service in the war. And finally, in 1784, all children of slaves born after that year, were declared free.

In the neighboring colonies, it disappeared about the same time. In Connecticut it was abolished by law. In Massachusetts, a practice grew up, of old worn out slaves bringing suits for freedom, and recovering judgment by the connivance of their masters; as the latter were by the judgment discharged from the liability to support them. And finally, a decision of their Supreme Court pronounced Slavery inconsistent with that clause in their constitution by which all men were declared free. But it had nearly died out before.¶

* Bancroft, I. 175.

† I. Salkeld, 666. The plaintiff declared in an indebitatus assumpsit, for a negro sold by the plaintiff to the defendant in England, and verdict for plaintiff, and on motion in arrest of judgment, "Holt C. J. held, that as soon as a negro comes into England, he becomes free: one may be a villain in England, but not a slave. Et per Powell, J. In a villain the owner has a property, but it is as an inheritance: * * * the law took no notice of a negro. Holt, J. C. You should have averred in the declaration, that the sale was in Virginia, and by the laws of that country negroes are saleable. * * * Therefore he directed the plaintiff should amend, and the declaration should be made, that the defendant was indebted to the plaintiff for a negro sold here in London, but that the said negro at the time of sale was in Virginia, and that negroes by the laws and statutes of Virginia are saleable as chattels. Then the Attorney General coming in, said they were inheritances, and transferable by deed and not without: and nothing was done."

Tenure by villanage was finally abolished in England, by Statute 12 Charles II. c. 24, A. D. 1659.

‡ Hubbard's N. E. 26.

§ Sewell, I. 278. Hinman's Blue Laws, 17. Gough's History of Quakers.

¶ Mass. Rep. IV. 128. Dane, ii. 313, 426. Washburn's Jud. Hist. Mass. 202.

THE RESCUE TRIALS.

HAYDEN'S CASE.

Mr. Hale's Closing Argument for the Prisoner.

FRIDAY, June 13.

About 12 o'clock Mr. Hale commenced his summing up for the defence in a speech of great eloquence and power, before he finished which the Court adjourned till this morning at 9. In some parts, Mr. Hale's argument was necessarily substantially the same as that in Scott's case, but it contained many passages which were entirely new and which must have told deeply on the Court and Jury as well as all who heard him. We cannot pretend to give more than a quite meagre sketch, which will serve to give the reader a faint idea of the line of argument and the tone of feeling which characterized the effort. Mr. Hale said—

May it please your Honor, and you Gentlemen of the Jury:

The charge against the defendant, as you are well aware, is one of great importance. It is one in which the public mind is deeply interested. It is one which it is your duty, as I know it will be your pleasure, to consider very carefully before deciding it.

In making out their indictment the government does not seem to have had a very distant view of the

crime they wished to punish. They have determined not to fail for not making charges enough and they have left you under some danger of being confused by the multiplicity of counts. But when you come to analyze these counts you will see there are two distinct classes. The first thirteen are under the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, and are subject to all the infirmities of that law. Under them it is necessary for the Government to prove that Shadrach, who was rescued, was at the time of the rescue not merely a slave and held by force as a slave, but held to service and labor by the laws of Virginia, and that such service and labor was due to the claimant DeBree. Otherwise he was not legally arrested, he had a right to escape and no one could be guilty for assisting him. The three last counts are not under the Fugitive Slave Law, but under the Act of 1790 against persons resisting officers in the service of legal process. But if the Government fail on the first thirteen counts, it cannot but fail on the last three, for if the arrest was not legal under the Fugitive Slave Law, under which, and under which only, it was made, it will hardly be claimed that it was legal under any other.

You, gentlemen, are to judge whether the case is made out which the Government has set forth in any of those counts, and it is a high responsibility which rests upon you. My study of the history of this and the mother country has taught me that there is no higher responsibility than this and that there is no greater political blessing than trial by jury. The great safeguard of all our liberties is the twelve men in a jury box, who are the supreme judges between the proscribed and the hand of power. It is here that the proud waves must be stayed. This is the limit where the will of the government ceases to the law, and reason and conscience assert their sovereign sway.

It would be idle to attempt to wink out of sight the fact that this case stands connected with a subject of wide spread political agitation, a subject on which from one extremity of the land to the other there have been the most extreme opinions, and I may say the most wonderful *changes* of opinion. We hear it said now that the Fugitive Slave Law is the support of this Union—the sole support of this Union—the sole support of it—the very Atlas on which the peace and safety and existence of the country rest. The maintenance and execution of the Fugitive Slave Law has become the sole religion of a great portion of the country. It is supposed that if we can so far conquer our prejudices as to give full effect to this law, the Union is saved and nothing more is required of us. And therefore, it is supposed to be very important that somebody should be convicted to show the vitality of the law; to show that it will be executed without reserve. But, gentlemen, everything of this character is to be banished from your minds. You sit here not for political purposes, but to try the issue between my client and the government, and you are sworn to find a righteous verdict without regard to its consequences.

Gentlemen, for the purposes of this trial I shall admit the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law. Not that I believe it to be so; far otherwise. In justice to myself, I must say that I believe it to be wholly unconstitutional. But his honor, the judge, will instruct you that it is constitutional, and though with all deference to the learned Court, I cannot believe it to be so, I have not the conceit to suppose that my humble word will weigh with you against his charge.

You are to decide the question of guilty or not guilty in the view of the law and the testimony. Of this I believe there is no question. But there is a controversy how far you are to receive the opinion of the Court on the law as the evidence of what the law is. And here I do not contend that the opinion of the learned bench may not be the highest evidence of what the law is, that can come before you. Still it is not the only evidence. You are to judge of its strength. If you believe what the judge says, is law, you are to find a verdict accordingly. But if you do not believe it, then your verdict will be otherwise. It is the duty of the witness to give you the facts so far as he knows them. There his responsibility ends. You are to judge of the hearing of the facts upon the question of guilt. So it is the duty of the judge to give you the law, and here his responsibility ends. You are to judge of the law as well as the facts. You are responsible for the whole verdict. It is yours and no power can go behind your decision. Your responsibility is like that of a mechanic, a carriage-maker for instance. He is responsible for the whole carriage, though he gets the iron-work of the blacksmith, and the leather work of the trimmer. Each of these workmen may be responsible to him for his own work, but he is responsible to the purchaser for the soundness of the whole job. We all have responsibilities gentlemen, and we cannot throw them off. Yours is to stand between the Government and this prisoner and judge of both the law and the facts in their bearing on the question of his guilt or innocence.

In a contest with the government the odds are always greatly against the prisoner at the bar. The government has its salaried judges, who are necessarily under a bias to sustain the law and the government under which they retain their powers; it has its learned prosecutors, who, by having their minds fully directed to the matter, are always ready to do the utmost to procure conviction; it has the national Treasury for these officers to dip into, to carry out any plans they may devise, and to give them unlimited command of witness. In consideration of this fearful odds, the law, in its tenderness for the prisoner, allows the presumption in his favor. It says that he shall be presumed to be innocent. The government, before it can ask of you a verdict of guilty, must have removed from your minds all reasonable doubt. If there is a reasonable doubt of his guilt left—I do not say a fanciful doubt—you are not to convict—you are to find a verdict of *not guilty*.

Gentlemen, admitting the constitutionality of this Fugitive Slave Law, the first thing that the Government has to do to make out a case is to show that Shadrach was a fugitive Slave, in the sense of the law and the Constitution. That sense is a definite and restricted one. The Constitution, you observe, does not use the term *slave*. The framers of that instrument did not recognize the right of Slavery; they did not agree to deliver up every body and anybody who might be held in Slavery, when escaped from one State into another. They used no such general language. They restricted their agreement to persons held to service and labor in any of the States *under the laws thereof*.

It was not enough that men should be in actual Slavery by force or fraud, they must be held legally and only those so held are to be delivered up. Our fathers baptized no wrong beyond the stern letter of the law. Therefore when a party comes here to claim a slave under the fugitive Slave Law, he is required to prove that such fugitive was bound to Slavery by the laws of the State from which he escaped. If Shadrach was not held as the Slave of DeBree under the laws of Virginia, he had a right to escape and Lewis Hayden or any body else had right to assist him.

Mr. Hale here read from the legal decision of the Virginia Courts, to show that in regard to men of Shadrach's color, the presumption is that they are free, and that any length of bondage, or even the confession of the slave himself, cannot prove Slavery. It must be proved by tracing descent on the mother's side from persons who were legally held as slaves. The testimony of the claimant that *he owned* Shadrach, is no proof that he held him under the laws, and a Southern law has decided, and it is law in Virginia, that if he had testified that he had owned him fifty years, it could be no proof of Slavery. The law knows nothing of owning a man. Gentlemen, the men who threw the tea overboard in Boston harbor will be remembered. The men who captured Major Andre will be remembered. Benedict Arnold himself will be remembered, but the first Boston jury that shall find a man a chattel, will be remembered longer than any of them. Men may be held, rightfully or wrongfully, to service or labor under the laws, but no law can convert a man into a thing—a mere piece of property.

[Mr. Hale here read copiously from English authorities, to show that by the Common Law Slavery is contrary to Nature and the Law of God. He also cited from the Civil Law, as laid down in the code of Justinian, to the same effect.]

Our fathers in asserting their own independence from an oppression—a thousand years of which would not be equal to a day of Slavery—proclaimed in the most solemn and authoritative manner, the same doctrine that one man cannot possess another. And they did not content themselves with carrying it up to courts held by presidential candidates—they fought for it. Now it has come to pass that if a man assert this doctrine, he is regarded as a traitor and a fanatic. But it was the doctrine of those who framed the Constitution. That instrument recognizes no right of property in man; it does not bind to the delivery of fugitives from Slavery in a general sense, but only of such persons as are held by State laws to service and labor. And what evidence does the Government offer in this case to prove that Shadrach was so held?

The Government has brought forward to prove the obligation of Shadrach to service and labor, the testimony of DeBree and Caphart, such as it is. And I am aware that the learned Court has ruled it to be testimony, but I am not aware that it has ruled that you shall consider their testimony satisfactory. If it did, it could not make you believe it so. Let us look at it. The presumption is that Shadrach is free. So says the law of Virginia. So says the Common Law. So says the Declaration of Independence. So say the Constitutions. DeBree swears that he OWNS him.

But his oath cannot establish a right of property to what God and Nature declares cannot be property. With all reverence, this question resolves itself into a question of veracity between God and DeBree. To all admitted subjects of property there are of course owners. To every one of these books there is or has been an owner. But if a man comes and swears that he owns a certain strip of moonshine, his oath cannot prove the claim to be anything more than moonshine. The moon will wax and wane, but the man will live after it has crumbled into nothing. Will DeBree own him then?

[As Mr. Hale made this point in the highest strain of eloquence, to which our sketch does no manner of justice, the audience in the Court room broke out into loud applause, and the Court with evident emotion ordered the officers to arrest any one who repeated the offence.]

This is the testimony of John DeBree. He swears that he *owns* Shadrach, that the man was actually a chattel in his possession! His having been so for fifty years would not have made him so by Virginia law. DeBree does not bring any document or proof that he was legally held to service and labor, or descended from parents so held. We might safely rest the case here. The Government, we may say, in the but cant expressive phrase, have not begun to make out a case. They have not brought a particle of proof to establish the ground for a case to rest on. But I will pass to the destiny of John Caphart.

Of Caphart, gentlemen, I have something to say. He is a man, who never refuses a job from a citizen. He himself has testified to you what his business is. He catches thieves and negroes. Yes, he is a slave-catcher—that is his profession. It is a profession loathed even in the slave States. I speak not without authority here, but know whereof I affirm. And if I were to exhaust my vocabulary of reproach, I could not begin to express the detestation with which this man is held in the slave States.

[Caphart was at this moment sitting within the bar and fanning himself with his beaver;—he seemed to find the air *rather* close.]

Such a man would not be considered deserving of credit at home. But whether you believe him or not, his testimony adds little to that of DeBree. He traces back Shadrach 16 years; during which he knows Shadrach has been a slave, but he does not swear nor bring any proof that he was legally such. He speaks of his father, and he knew an old woman who was the reputed wife of his father, who was a slave. But he does not swear that the old woman was his mother. His testimony does not in the least degree answer the requirements of the Virginia law to establish the fact of Slavery. Yet it is on this miserable testimony that you are called upon to convict my client. When Slavery demands this, it transcends all bounds of law and constitution. It seeks to swallow up all our rights and liberties. To this flood of overwhelming despotism, I pray God to interpose the barrier of an honest Massachusetts Jury.

The rest of the case, compared with this, is mere boy's play. You know well enough what the Government have proved. But let me remind you what they attempted to prove. What they attempted to prove and did not, makes the strongest kind of testimony. Well, then, they promised to prove to you five distinct points. First, that Hayden said he would rescue Shadrach. Second, that he told Shadrach so. Third, that he had Shadrach carried to his house. Fourth, that he had hold of him and got into a cab with him. Fifth, that he carried him out of town in a carriage. Of these five points, they have failed to bring any proof of four.

As to the first point, that Hayden said he would rescue Shadrach, the Government have brought no witnesses. They offered to bring a Reporter, but he was ruled out, and I have nothing to say about him. There is none of the promised proof that Hayden had said he would rescue Shadrach. This does not rise to the dignity of a failure. To fail, a man must have had capital to commence business. Here was no capital at all. There was nothing to fail on.

The next point is, did he tell Shadrach he would rescue him. Here the Government have offered a witness, a very remarkable one—Charles Sawin, the Deputy Marshal. Charles Sawin, gentlemen, is something more than a witness. He is a physiologist. We did not expect that this case would involve physiology, but it has developed something new in that science. You would hardly have found a physiologist in the country who would have ventured to affirm such a physiological fact as Mr. Sawin is sure of.

Mr. Sawin is a man who believes in witchcraft. He believes in a good time coming. The Scriptures says that when the Ethiopian shall change his skin and the leopard his spots, then may they who have been accustomed to do evil learn to do well. The Millenium must be close at hand. Mr. Sawin believes in this change as a physiological fact. There is no deceiving him. He sees through everything. He swears that he saw Hayden, knew him and heard him speak to Shadrach, and tell him he would stand by him, and that he was then several shades *lighter* than he is now! Hayden may change his skin as much as he likes, he cannot deceive Sawin. But however sharp Mr. Sawin may have been as a physiologist, he is not borne out by other witnesses as to the identity with Hayden of the man who spoke to Shadrach. Mr. Marcus Morton stood where he could see the man who spoke to Shadrach. He knew Hayden, and he says the person who spoke to Shadrach was not Hayden. But Mr. Morton is no physiologist, and if he were one, perhaps we ought to allow that against such a physiologist as Sawin, he might be mistaken. We must bring Mr. S. May, Jr. who swears that he knows Hayden, that he saw the person speaking to Shadrach, while sitting in the seats where you do, and that the man was not Hayden.

The Government, gentlemen, have found that Mr. May comes from 21 Cornhill, the Anti-Slavery office; I hardly know what they wish to have inferred from that. They evidently deem it of importance, and it may mean something. But I hope gentlemen that in our progress we have not progressed so far as to refuse to believe a man who has perilled his position and reputation in the world that he might labor for liberty. If Mr. May is to be believed, Hayden was not the man who spoke to Shadrach, and then mysteriously grew darker and shorter, as Mr. Sawin has it. Again, Mr. Edward Dexter, coming in here and seeing that an attempt was making to prove that Hayden was the individual who spoke to Shadrach, involuntarily exclaimed that he was not the man. He says the man was taller and several shades lighter. Mr. Dexter is no volunteer—his sense of justice obliged him to testify to what he had a good opportunity to know. Next Mr. J. N. W. Yerrinton testifies that he knows Hayden and he was not the man who spoke to Shadrach. So says Mr. G. B. Wells, a lawyer in the court. All these witnesses go to prove positively that Lewis Hayden did not speak to Shadrach.

But there is another witness and a very important witness, about whom I have something to say, Mr. George T. Curtis, the United States Commissioner. It is not for me to speak disrespectfully of Mr. Curtis. But I must say, that I think if ever there was a witness on the stand of whose testimony it might be said that "tall oaks from little acorns grow," it is Mr. Curtis. Mr. Curtis was called by us. Knowing how he prides himself upon his character, and what he had testified in Scott's case, we called him. He had sworn in Scott's case that it was a tall, light complexioned colored man who spoke to Shadrach, and told him he would stand by him. When called by us he says the individual he saw was much the same complexion as Hayden. Stand up Hayden. [Hayden, who is a black man and *not tall*—at all, stood up.] There he is, gentlemen, and you can judge for yourselves. The government finding themselves in need of more testimony, and aware of the growing nature of Mr. Curtis's, called him again, and asked what was the strength of his impression, what was his degree of confidence that the individual he saw was Hayden. Mr. Curtis here takes a distinction. He is a man of nice distinctions, and probaby understands the one he makes in this case, though I no not. He says he was not asked his opinion before, but was merely called on the question of identification. I confess I do not see the difference at all. But Mr. Curtis now swears that the inclination of his belief is that Hayden was the man!

Mr. Curtis was brought four times on the stand, and this is the result of his testimony, that seeing the exigency of the Government's case he has a growing inclination to believe that Hayden, the very black and rather short man, is the "tall, light-complexioned colored man," whom he swore he saw in Scott's case. Mr. Jones was called, and he swears that the witness Griffin was the man who spoke to Shadrach. Griffin is tall but very black, as if he had been born in the great eclipse. I wish Mr. Curtis could have seen this tall, *light-complexioned* colored man.

The Government has brought no witness, according to their promise, to prove that Shadrach was carried to Hayden's house. On the contrary, three witnesses, of respectable appearance and who are not impeached, swear that they had the means of knowing, who were there at the time, and Shadrach was not brought there. Thus the first three points which the government set out to prove are not only left without proof, but we have proved positively the contrary.

We next come, gentlemen of the jury, to the promised proof of the government, that Hayden had an agency in carrying off Shadrach. Isaac Bullard swears he saw Hayden at 10 minutes before two, outside of the Court House, at the time Shadrach was carried off. Simeon Wright swears that he saw him, or a man answering to his description, at 10 minutes after two, in the same place. I will not stop to quarrel about this discrepancy. Dr. Hanson also swears to seeing Hayden in that place at about that time, and it may safely be admitted as proved that he was there. But Henry Emerson, if he is to be believed, saw Hayden coming down the stairs and having hold of Shadrach. This witness when asked for his occupation says, that his business is collecting and dealing in junk *and so forth*. Lord Coke in his commentaries upon Littleton says in a note that there is often an important meaning in the words "and so forth." So it is to be presumed, in this case, that Emerson mentioned "junk" as the most respectable part of his business, including in the and so forth things which would not so well bear mentioning. But there are two other dealers in junk on the stand, and I shall defer my remarks on that article till I can take them all in the same dish.

Emerson is the only witness save Simon Wright who saw Hayden in connection with Shadrach, till he got to Garden St. There he met Garretty, another dealer in junk, who swears he saw him get into a cab. And then we have Ellis Wright, another witness of the same sort who swears he knew Hayden and saw him get into the cab. These three witnesses swore that Hayden was one of those who got into the cab, got out again, and then went up Garden street to Southac street, and then up to the church, where they lost sight of Shadrach and Hayden. I confess that when I heard these witnesses I did not believe they were telling the truth. It seemed to me that they were telling what they knew to be false. But, gentlemen, when I heard Sawin swear that he was sure of seeing Hayden as the person who spoke to Shadrach, and Jones swear that he was sure that Griffin was that man. And when I heard Mr. Commissioner Curtis testify that the inclination of his belief was that a tall, light complexioned colored man was Hayden, I began to doubt. Here are men in official stations—commissioners, marshals, constables—swearing to a question of identity in which they are obviously mistaken.

If such distinguished persons can make such mistakes, what is to be expected of junk dealers? Why if Mr. Commissioner Curtis, had seen that individual address Shadrach before the adjournment of his Court, he might have ordered him to be arrested, to be punished on summary process—that is what commissioners deal in—for contempt of court. And suppose he had given two warrants, one to Sawin and one to Jones, to arrest the same individual on his description, without naming him.

What should we have seen? Sawin would have arrested Hayden, and Jones would have arrested Griffin on the same identical description as the person guilty of the contempt. [Here the two persons stood up together, when the difference was quite ludicrous, both however being anything but light complexioned.] When such blunders can be made by the distinguished officers of the Court I must say that some charity is due to junk dealers.

But after all, I cannot rid my mind of suspicion in regard to the veracity of Emerson. You saw his appearance. He was too smart. A witness who is so fond of a pert answer is not likely to stick for the truth He was too careless in his statements. When asked his business, he said he sometimes earned $10 a day.

The same remarks apply to Garretty and Ellis Wright They are all of them dealers in junk. I know little about this buisness but what I see in the newspapers From them I gather that dealers in junk are on the watch for almost all sorts of gain. They employ idle boys to get what they can lay their hands on. They are always ready for stolen goods and have plenty of places to conceal them.

Mr. Hale, after thouroughly using up these witnesses, passed to the testimony of Beal and Doherty the owner and driver of the cab who were in circumstances to know who entered, who both knew Hayden, saw the persons in the cab break the glass, and watched closely to know who they were in order to recover damages, and both swear that Hayden was not one of the men who got into the cab. He then showed by the testimony of Peter Manning, Henry P. Trask, Richardson, Williams, Littlefield and Moss, that Hayden came down Cambridge street behind the crowd, and was seen by and talked with them after the crowd passed up Garden street. From all this he concluded that it was absolutely and positively proved that Hayden did not get into the cab with Shadrach.

Mr. Hale then proceeded to examine the only witness, Murray the carriage driver, on the remaining point that Hayden employed him to carry off Shadrach. On this witness the whole case rested. But he had testified that he had received $3 for the job, whereas he accounted to his employer for only half that sum. If he was unfaithful in one of the most confidential relations of life how could he be expected to speak the truth on the stand. This witness was justly thouroughly demolished before the learned counsel had done with him, and he then closed by a general appeal to the jury, of which our limits forbid us now to attempt even a sketch.

Mr. Hale finished his plea about eleven o'clock, when after a short recess, Mr. District Attorney Lunt commenced summing up for the government, and soon talked the Court room clear of nearly all but court and jury, who seemed to have a hard struggle with their propensity to slumber. Mr. Lunt evidently saw that he was making a dead failure, when he rallied sufficiently to procure an adjournment on the plea of *ill health*, to half past nine Monday morning.

MR. LUNT'S ARGUMENT FOR GOVERNMENT.

He had listened with some degree of care to the harangue which had been addressed to the sympathies and passions of the Jury. He desired and intended to, address what he should say to their reasons. He was glad he could do so without making such appeals as had been made to them. The jury has no right to enter into any other consideration except that which relates to the violation of the laws of the country. They having sworn that they have no bias, no prejudices, and that they have not made up their minds or even expressed an opinion upon the question at issue, and further, having voluntarily placed themselves upon the Jury, will be expected to render a verdict according to the law as administered by the Court, and the evidence put in the case. The counsel for defence has asserted that this case is the result of political persecution. Such is not the fact. Hayden is arraigned and upon trial for violating the laws of the country; for this and nothing else.

The District Attorney descanted somewhat at length upon the awful fate that awaits liars and perjurers—He spoke with much earnestness of the ignominy which would surround and follow a juror in this life who would take an oath to try an issue by law and evidence and then render a verdict in opposition to both. The retribution which such a man would receive at the final judgement day was given in a strain of religious eloquence seldom if ever equalled by any pulpit orator in the land. The speaker did not believe there was one man upon the panel liable to become the recipient of such a retribution. He did not suspect that one man of them would violate his oath. As to prejudices against color, none existed on the part of the Government to his knowledge. His sympathies were all with the prisoner. So far as his knowledge extends the sympathies of all the white population, North and South are with the negro race, notwithstanding what others may say to the contrary.

The gentleman who opened this case for the defence [Mr. Dana] said the persons should be thanked who in moments of peril stood between the enraged colored population of this city and the government. No person having the slightest faculties or nerve has ever had any idea or fear that the law would be resisted. There was no cause for fear. The Government was safe enough in the hands of its agents, without any aid from others especially from those who had travelled all over the State preaching disobedience to the Fugitive law. [The courageous District Attorney did not explain, in this connection, why the Court House was in chains; why the night and day Watch and Police forces of this city were armed and kept constantly upon duty in and around the Court House; why the 1st Regiment of Light Infantry, a detachment of Artillery, and the Horse Company of Lancers, were summoned to be in readiness, for actual duty at a moment's warning; and also, why several of those companies were constantly under arms, in actual service, provided with *ball cartridges*, why the President issued his proclamation; the two branches of the City Government their orders; and lastly, why "Daniel Webster was mortified" and Henry Clay "seized with consternation!"]

Mr. Lunt said he should not argue the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law. He should consider it an insult to the jury to do so, since they have sworn that they believe it to be constitutional. The Judge would instruct them on this point. He had already ruled in a previous case that the law is constitutional. No person has a right to oppose a law simply because he believes it to be unconstitutional.

The gentleman then proceeded to review the testimony. He said the counsel for defence had only played round it, and had not touched it; that they had not come within one hundred thousand leagues of it. He was satisfied there was concert of action on the part of the rescuers of Shadrach. The defendant was pledged beforehand to resist the Fugitive Slave Law. He resolved to do so repeatedly in public meetings.

The jury could judge of the respectability of DeBree by his appearance on the stand. They can do the same with regard to Caphart. His business is to take thieves and catch negroes. These are his duties as an officer. Have yet to learn that such a position unabused is not an honorable one. He believed Caphart's testimony legal, positive and sufficient.

The Counsel on the other side [Mr. Hale] had laughed a great deal at Mr. Sawin's testimony about Hayden's color; thinks it an absurb principle of physiology that defendant "was several shades lighter on the day of the rescue than he is now." He nevertheless had no doubt of it. It was a physiological fact.

The District Attorney had seen with his own eyes a black coat look perfectly white in the sun. He put it to the jury to say if they had not witnessed a similar phenomenon. The absence of the blood from the head always makes the skin of the face grow pale. Such must have been the case with the defendant on the day of the rescue.

The District Attorney, in passing upon the evidence, thought it might be considered doubtful to the minds of the Jury that Hayden was all the time with that crowd. He did not care whether he was or not. Mr. Homer testified that Shadrach had his coat on when he passed out the door of this room, but in going down stairs the coat was taken off. This may account for the bundle that Hayden had when he was seen going down Cambridge street, just in the rear of the crowd. After leaving the Court House, Hayden, finding the coat gone undoubtedly went back and got it, and then rejoined the party after they got in Garden street.

[Shadrach was seen ever after, according to the testimony, with his coat off. Mr. Lunt did not explain to the Jury why he did not put the coat on which Hayden was so generous as to go back and get.]

With reference to the testimony of Mr. Ellis Wright, the bowling saloon superintendent, the gentleman said it was a fact that a person could not always select their occupation. Mr. Wright had been employed in a bowling saloon. Bowling is practiced in this city to a greater or less extent by the most respectable citizens. Bowling saloons are regulated and licensed by the City. Gentlemen like myself cannot go into the country for exercise such as is very necessary. Exercise we must have for the preservation of our health. These places are established and kept open for such purposes.

A few minutes past 1 o'clock, Mr. Lunt informed the Court that he should probably occupy about one hour more, but as his health was quite poor he would like to finish on Monday. The Court then adjourned until Monday morning at half past nine o'clock.

MONDAY, June 16.

The Court came in at half-past 9 o'clock.

Proceedings were delayed some time by the lateness of counsel. Mr. Lunt proceeded with his argument at 15 minutes to 10 and spoke until 12 o'clock. He dwelt with some earnestness upon the admission of the counsel for defence that the Constitution does provide for the rendition of fugitive slaves and argued therefore that the conscientious portion of the case was entirely swept away.

He said the government witnesses have not had the remotest interest in the case and therefore must have told the truth, but Beal and Doherty, witnesses for the defence must have lied!

The gentleman's argument, if it can be called such, embraced no new points of interest, except that Massachusetts is now governed by "the upstart and puny mushrooms of an hour!" We therefore prefer to use the space it would occupy, if reported, for more important and interesting matter. At the close of the address a recess of five minutes was granted by the court.

THE JUDGES CHARGE TO THE JURY.

At five minutes past twelve the judge began his charge by denouncing in the most emphatic terms, the mischievous notion "that the jury are to judge of the law as well as of the facts, which he declared to be an usurpation of legislative functions belonging to a very different body. The question that had been raised, as to whether Shadrach was a slave or not, was of no consequence with regard to the last three counts of the indictment, under which he was tried; as the offence therein charged was the rescue of a prisoner from legal custody, in violation of the law of 1790. That Shadrach was in such custody was not contested. It was for the jury, then, to judge whether Lewis Hayden had any share in taking him from that custody, and if so, they must find him guilty on the last three counts. He was guilty if he had participated in, aided or encouraged the rescue, at any time or at any place—whether in the Court House or out of it, in Boston or in Cambridge

With regard to the first thirteen Counts, the judge said the question was, not whether there are slaves in Massachusetts, but in Virginia. That there were slaves, or persons held to service and labor in Virginia was not disputed. Was then, the prisoner Shadrach one of those persons? Was he a slave? The testimony of DeBree and Caphart he thought proved conclusively that he was. If Hayden, therefore, had participated in any way in his rescue he was guilty under the law of 1850—the fugitive slave act. The verdict of the jury upon this point must be determined solely by the evidence.

The humanity or inhumanity of the law had nothing whatever to do with the matter. Upon that evidence the judge would not comment, as the state of his eyesight had prevented him from taking notes of it, and his usual amanuensis was too ill to attend.

The charge occupied three quarters of an hour. It was marked by Judge Sprague's unquestionable ability, and was delivered in an impressive and dignified manner. Its tone was, on the whole, decidedly unfavorable to the prisoner.

TUESDAY, June 17th.

At 9 o'clock this morning, the Court came in to hear the second report of the jury, in Lewis Hayden's case, after being out all night. After calling the names of defendant and the jury, the result was arrived at as follows:

Clerk—Gentlemen of the Jury, have you agreed upon a verdict?

Foreman—We have not.

Sprague, J.—Have you agreed upon any of the counts.

Foreman—We have not.

Sprague J.—Are you in doubt upon any matter of Law?

Foreman—We are not. We are united upon the law.

Sprague J.—Then gentlemen I cannot detain you further upon the facts.

The Jury were then dismissed for the term and told to go to the Marshal for their pay.

The Jury stood nine for conviction and three for acquittal.

There were expressions of joy observed upon many of the countenances in the crowded audience when the words "*We cannot agree*" were uttered by the Foreman of the Jury. We heard some curses from a Southern student, who has made himself quite conspicuous in the Court room, during the trials, because "the damn'd nigger" was not convicted.

—FAREWELL SOIREE TO GEORGE THOMPSON.—Agreeably to notice, this Soireé was held in the elegant and spacious Assembly Room, over the Boston and Worcester Railroad Depot, on Monday evening last. The weather was all that could be desired,—the clear, full moon, at midnight, and at a later hour, as the immense throng dispersed to their several abodes, serving by its effulgence to give enchantment to the scene. At 7 o'clock, the doors were thrown open, and in the course of thirty minutes, nearly every seat was occupied. More than a thousand plates were set, and yet hundreds of applications for tickets during the day had to be denied, for want of the room, to the immense disappointment of those who had unluckily waited till the eleventh hour, and who, from the size of the hall, had anticipated no difficulty in gaining an admission.

At 8 o'clock, the distinguished guest of the evening, accompanied by the officers of the meeting, entered the hall, and was received with reiterated cheers and plaudits. Edmund Quincy, Esq., presided with his usual admirable tact and ability—with Mr. Thompson on his right, and Mr. Garrison on his left: and on either side of these, Rodney French, Esq., of New Bedford, Hon. E. L. Keyes, C. L. Remond, Rev. Mr. Mathews, the Baptist missionary who was recently lynched in Kentucky, Dea. Timothy Gilbert, and Joseph Southwick. In other parts of the hall were Hon. Henry Wilson, late President of the Senate, Wendell Phillips and Francis Jackson, Esqs., Rev. Theodore Parker, Rev. John Pierpont, Henry C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury, Charles C. Burleigh, and a multitude of other widely known friends of emancipation.

The spectacle was heart-cheering and sublime. A greater amount of intellectual, moral and philanthropic excellence, we verily believe, has not been brought together on any occasion, since the settlement of Boston. It was a splendid tribute to the genius, eloquence, and exalted moral worth of Mr. THOMPSON; none higher, none more to be desired, could be given to any man living.

The tables were spread and all the arrangements made by that eminent caterer, Mr. J. B. SMITH; and an abundant supply of substantial food, with the delicacies of the season served up in the best style, fully demonstrated, in view of the very reasonable admission fee, how little regard he had for his own pecuniary success, and how much for the perfect gratification of all present.

At the expiration of the hour devoted to a vigorous discussion of the many good things on the table, the President made a very pertinent introductory speech.

He was followed by Mr. Garrison in an address to Mr Thompson, who responded at considerable length, and in an impressive and eloquent manner, interrupted frequently by the strongest demonstration of applause; followed by Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, C. L. Remond, Rodney French, Rev. Mr. Matthews, and James N. Buffum, whose remarks elicited much applause.

In the course of the proceedings, it was announced that the Jury in the case of Lewis Hayden could not agree, and were locked up for the night, while he was permitted to be present in the hall. The intelligence 'brought down the house' with thunders of applause, which was deepened when Mr. Hayden, at the request of the President, took an elevated position so as to be seen by the whole assembly.

During the evening, a colored band kindly volunteered its services, and performed a variety of pieces adapted to the occasion.

As we are desirous of laying the proceedings of the meeting consecutively and in full before the readers of our paper, and are unable to do so this week, we defer further comments on this brilliant and successful Soireé till another number of *The Liberator*.

It was about 1 o'clock in the morning before the great assembly broke up. Many friends were present from the neighboring towns—some from a long distance.—*Liberator*.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1851.

AMERICAN CLERGYMEN IN ENGLAND.

THE pro-slavery Clergy of this Country who are visiting or are about to visit England, will, if warned in time, follow the example of a friend of ours in Massachusetts, who is so unfortunate as to bear a very striking resemblance to a Methodist parson, residing in the same town. Mortified at being sometimes congratulated on the progress of a revival, or received in an eating-house or a shop by some pious bar-keeper or shop-tender with a deference, which however much he may be conscious is really his due, he is also painfully certain is, in these cases, rendered, not to his merit, but to his unlucky likeness to somebody else, our friend has made a solemn covenant with himself never to appear in public in anything but a blue coat with bright buttons, covered in winter by the most unclerical great-coat, both in cut and color, that his tailor can acheive. And albeit our friend is a modest man, and a staunch conformist to the ways of the world, we are looking forward with apprehension to the time when he will adopt some outrageous costume—a slouched hat with feathers, trunk-hose, and rosettes in his shoes, or perhaps even a Bloomer—so unhappy is his life made by the want of discrimination in the world, which will not observe that the gentleman in blue or white coat, and black cravat, to whom it so frequently pulls off its hat, is not the Rev. Mr. McHowler. Indeed, we hear that he is lately driven almost to extremity, not only by the difficulty of avoiding the warm attentions and deferential observation which is accorded to the supposed Mr. McHowler, but from the fact that he has recently been mistaken also for a Unitarian clergyman who is well known to be a man of very loose principles in the matter of clerical dress and bearing, is notorious for braving public opinion with a black tie, has been detected when away from home, in wearing a frock coat, and has been seen even by our admiring eyes, within a week, sporting, in the most open and licentious manner, an eye-glass and a *stickee*. Yet desperate as the case of this gentleman is, we nevertheless should not hesitate, should we be heeded, to recommend his example to all of the cloth who are about going abroad or are now in England. A black cravat, and blue coat; even a white hat with a narrow brim, a flashy vest, and the dainty little cane, would help to disguise them where they are personally unknown, and save them from being pointed at in Great Britian as that unfortunate and miserable class, the man-catching, slave driving, woman-whipping, child-stealing ministers of the American Slaveholding Church. The lean and curious look of Brother Jonathan in a black coat of a sober cut, and in white cravat may prove as unfortunate a mark in England, for the next six months, though not exactly in the same way, as the long moustache of Marshal Haynau.

We have published from time to time Resolutions passed by various religious bodies in Great Britain as to what they deemed the proper course to pursue in relation to pro-slavery clergymen from the United States. It is only in a very few Anti-Slavery papers, in this Country, that any information is given to the American Clergy of the probable reception that awaits most of them abroad, and we feel that our own paper has a new claim upon their gratitude for dealing as faithfully with them in this matter as it is our habit of doing in all that pertains to their relation to the Anti-Slavery Cause. Our advice, we dare say, will not be heeded, though there is a better chance than usual of its being listened to, inasmuch as the fine gloss of the cloth, and the immaculate purity of the neck-kerchief is known sometimes to be dimmed and dusted when errant shepherds are away from home. It may be, therefore, that prejudice in favour of the Clerical costume is not so deep-seated but that it might yield to the emergency of the occasion, could the clergy be made to apprehend the important and mortifying fact that their only hope of comfort on British ground, lies in the negative merits of brass buttons and vests of many colors.

Many of them, however, will probably resort to the more obvious and natural process of turning their coats rather than changing them. The clerical character in that way may be maintained—and, we fear, in some cases, in more than one sense—while the awkwardness of new outward habiliments may be avoided. But it is not so certain that this method will be so successful as it has been heretofore. Those people in England who are disposed to make Anti-Slavery a test of Christian sincerity have come to look for something more than mere verbal assent to Anti-Slavery principles; they ask for the evidence of an Anti-Slavery life. And so familiar have they become with the progress of the cause among us that it is not an easy matter for an American Clergyman, who has been opposed, or indifferent to it at home to palliate such a course by brave words abroad.

With the Unitarian Clergymen particularly this question becomes more and more formidable. Without pretending to the right of excommunication, or of denial of Church fellowship, or of the right to sit in judgment upon the character of an erring brother, this sect in England seems to go farther, on this question of Anti-Slavery, than any of those who arrogate to themselves far more stringent authority and discipline in Church relations. They are disposed to look upon slaveholding, and either a positive or negative defence of it, as unquestionably sinful, and to be dealt with as they, even with their cautious reluctance to interfere with the individual judgment and conscience, would deal with any other sin. A man notorious as a thief or for sustaining a connection with thieves which he refuses to break, and even defends, would not be admitted as a preacher to a Unitarian pulpit anywhere, because notoriously and essentially an immoral man. A man notorious for defending Slavery, or known as one who is indifferent to its existence, is held by a considerable portion of the English Unitarians as clearly under the condemnation of being equally an immoral man with the convicted thief. Perhaps no American clergyman has ever enjoyed greater popularity abroad than Dr. Dewey. There are many pulpits in England into which he would not now be admitted, and the doors of many private dwellings, where his presence would once have been held as an honor, would now be closed against him. The warm personal regard and strong reverence for his character which have hitherto been extended toward him have yielded to detestation as strong for the relation in which he now stands to the giant sin of our day and country. "I grieve," writes a warm Unitarian in Leeds to a friend here, "I grieve to find Dr Dewey so pro-slavery, and uttering such sentiments as have lately been reported in the papers as his on the base Fugitive Law. Surely he must have forgotten his Christianity, and that he professes to be a Christian teacher, and a follower of one who would indeed have mourned over such a disciple, and been inclined to say to him, 'Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me.' . . . . I take up Dr Dewey's writings now with far less pleasure than I used to do, thinking how base he has become." And strong as this expression will seem to Unitarians generally, who have a testimony against plain language, the feeling, we are persuaded, is a very common one with many of that sect in England, and their reception of him, should he go among them, would be in accordance with it. And if such be the estimation in which the great American leader of the sect is held abroad, the more humble brethren who are content to walk as his followers and imitators at home, must look for such measure of reward as usually falls to the lot of followers and imitators; nor can others who have a name and fame of their own, independent of Dr. Dewey, expect better treatment.

It is gratifying, however, to know that the censure of our English friends is by no means indiscriminate. They walk by sight and not by faith in this matter, and know whereof they affirm when they condemn any man as Pro-Slavery, as witness the following Resolutions passed at a recent meeting of the Lewin's Mead Congregation at Bristol.

"Resolved, That we desire to express our cordial approval of the determination of our respected ministers to ascertain, if possible, from such American clergymen as may visit this city, whether they are laboring, in any way, for the overthrow of Slavery; and to invite none to their pulpit who have directly or indirectly, by speech or by silence, given support to this outrage on humanity, or who have failed to raise their voices against the unchristian law for restoring the fugitive to his oppressor."

"That while we feel bound by reverence for our common Christianity thus to remonstrate with all clergymen in the United States who have even by their silence sanctioned the continuance of Slavery, we rejoice at the same time, to record our grateful appreciation of such honored exceptions as the Revs. Dr. Furness, Messrs. S. J. May, Pierpoint, Stetson, Weiss, S. May (Jun), N. Hall, Shackford, Buckingham, Higginson, Sargent, Johnson, Dr. Willard, and other valued names, who, in obedience to the call of duty, have not hesitated to sacrifice the esteem of their *brethren* in the *faith* for the sake of their *brethren in bonds*."

A PRAYER FOR SLAVERY.

WHEN we recorded, last week, the "burthen" of prayer which the Rev. Dr. Gilman, the Unitarian clergyman of Charleston, S. C., cast upon the Lord at the Disunion Convention held recently in that city, we were not aware that another and a far heavier burthen from one of his orthodox brethren had been made public, and to which the exclamation of the little girl, whose story we told, was still more applicable. This is reported as having been made by the Rev Dr. Bachman, a Lutheran clergyman, and for that peculiar kind of blasphemy which asks for the Divine blessing and guidance for a system which sets at defiance every law of God, exceeds any thing we have ever seen, excepting only one of the last winter's sermons of the Rev. Dr. Spring of this city, who pronounced the African race the children of the Devil, and accursed of God, and therefore slaves by the Divine will. Here is the petition of the Rev. Dr. Bachman:

We beseech thee, Almighty God, in behalf of that institution which recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the master and the obligations and duties of the servant. We thank thee that in thy divine and holy word thou hast laid down rules for the Government of both—so that the former may not become an oppressor, or the latter be led on by wicked passions and evil advisers to rise up in rebellion against his lawful master, protector and friend. We pray that we may be the humble instruments in thy hand of shedding the light of thy Gospel over the minds of a benighted race. That the folly of those who would reduce them beyond the level of humanity, and incapable of understanding, or receiving the truths of Christianity, may be made manifest by the orderly deportment, the affectionate obedience and the devoted piety of the humble servant, who, whilst he is identified with a race of higher intelligence who will be his protectors and guides, approaches also the altar of the same God, feels that he has an equal interest in the atoning blood of the same Saviour; and that, after having mutually performed their duties in their several stations in their families on earth, they may have an assured hope of being reunited in a land of light, of happiness and immortality, in the regions of eternal Glory."

COLORED PEOPLE'S PUBLIC MEETING IN JAMAICA, L. I. AND THE TRIBUNE.

AT a large and spirited meeting, held in Bethel Church, the 18th instant, the accompanying resolutions were adopted after much discussion, without dissent:

Resolved, That we look with pleasure upon the evidences of progress among the free people of color throughout the country, and also of the growing intelligence of the slave population as manifested by the increasing numbers who escape from bondage notwithstanding the redoubled vigilance of the masters and the facilities afforded the human monsters who pursue them.

Resolved, That we regret exceedingly the position and conduct of that portion of the colored community who have been corrupted and debauched by the evil example, influence, and practices of their white neighbors, and we pledge ourselves to renew our endeavors to redeem and restore them.

Resolved, That the recently published false and slanderous statements, in reference to the colored people of Jamaica, are perfectly in accordance with the long continued and despicably mean policy of our oppressors, who traduce and villify a people when they have robbed their forefathers of their all, themselves of their most estimable right, and are now depriving their children of Education, by violating the provisions of the State, and misappropriating their portion of the public school funds.

Resolved, That we will never cease to urge our claims either for admission on terms of equality into the Public Schools, or for the establishment of separate Schools for our children until our object is attained.

Resolved, That the African Colonization Scheme is as wicked, foolish and impracticable as ever in our view, and we here proclaim our unshaken determination to remain in this, our native land.

SAMUEL SMITH, Chairman.

ROBERT JONES, Secretary.

The *Tribune*, in copying the above Resolutions, remarks that it has nothing to say against the warmth of language which the framers thereof have seen fit to employ. It is kind enough to overlook some feeling on their part inasmuch as it presumes they have not been treated with the "full tenderness of humanity." It thinks, however, that their complaint of suffering, past and present, does not tally well with their last Resolutions, and cannot conceive how that can be "a wicked and foolish scheme which opens to the victims of wrong a secure and peaceful refuge from its pangs."

The *Tribune* has recently been publishing some ratherish good Anti-Slavery articles, and it was high time to look out for something in favor of Colonization. That paper is always mindful of the rule to let the bane and the antidote go together. It is never overtaken with a fit of Anti-Slavery zeal, that it does not immediately follow it up with a full course of denunciation of negroes and Abolitionists. It is never seized with a desire to abolish Slavery that Abolition does not become a perfect mania with it, and it is unwilling to stop short of abolishing the negroes at the same time. Whether this is from some peculiarity in the constitution of that excellent daily, or whether there is so much method in its madness that it calculates to find toleration for an unpopular heresy by advocating, with all its zeal, a popular sentiment, we will not take it upon ourselves to decide.

It is perhaps too much for the colored people to expect that the *Tribune* shall amend its principles, but it is not too much for them to ask that it shall correct its logic. It, at one time, advocates Colonization because the negro race is too base and besotted in its character ever to permit it to live in the presence of a superior race in any other capacity than as a hewer of wood and drawer of water. The colored man, so it reasons, is a waiter, a boot-black, a barber, or a slave, because he has not the spirit and energy to be anything else, and not because the white man has denied him any privilege. The fact that he remains in a servile or menial capacity is, *ipso facto*, proof that he can be raised to no higher position in the social scale till placed in new circumstances. It follows, therefore, as a legitimate conclusion, that we, the white race, can only wash our hands of this crime, of some centuries standing now, by shipping back again to Africa this whole colored race—including, we suppose, the mixed blood of one half, three-quarters, seven-eigths, and intermediate grades of the two races—there to work out their own salvation and destiny with such spirit and energy as those that are spared by acclimation can. Whether

the *Tribune* adopts the popular theory that it was a part of the Divine Scheme from the beginning that Africa should thus be civilized and christianized, including all the intermediate steps, from the stealing of the first African to the emancipation and shipping back the last slave whom concubinage may have made a seven-eighths white man, we shall not undertake to say.

But let the colored men anywhere, like those on Long Island, rise up and repudiate this course of reasoning, and declare that they will no longer submit to degradation and wrong—that they will no longer submit to be hewers of wood and drawers of water—that they demand the right to be educated—that they have served long enough as mere bootblacks and waiters—that they recognize and will maintain their right to live something above the lowest round in the social scale—then our socialist neighbour, who is so eloquent upon the necessity of a new social organization for the sake of the lower class among whites, pats the colored man good-naturedly upon the back, forgets his theory of natural inequality, and says—" My good fellow, you know that is all nonsense. You never can rise here where you are so oppressed; we white folks never can admit you to an equality. Come, don't be foolish. Go to Africa, my dear fellow. It is an excellent country; some fever and a scarcity of rice, to-be-sure, but you won't mind that when you get used to it. Consider—the Providence of God—civilization—Christianity—equality—and all that, you know. Come, you 'd better go, before worse comes of it!"

Were we a colored man, we should be disposed to turn upon our kind neighbor and ask him to tell us precisely what he means and what he wants. " Am I to go, sir, because I can't rise, or because you won't let me. If you think I can't, will you give me a chance and help me to try. But if you don't mean to let me, say so in plain terms, and I shall know then how much you are my friend, and can calculate pretty accurately how sincere you are in declaring my incapacity. If I am down because the white man's foot is on me, get him to take it off, and see if I won't rise; but if I lie still because I choose, don't tell me I can't get up because you've got me down, and so persuade me to let me be shipped off to where I don't want to go."

It strikes us that the *Tribune* might make out a case, at least, more to the credit of its manliness, and if the colored people say they do not want to go to Africa, that it might believe they know enough to form an opinion on that subject.

THE ENGLISH CONGREGATIONAL UNION AND SLAVERY.

The London *Inquirer*, of a late date, says that the Congregational Union of England—a body similar in its Constitution to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association—have taken a very decided and spirited course upon the subject of American Slavery. The subject came up at the recent Annual Meeting of that body, and a Resolution was offered condemnatory of the Fugitive Slave Act, but suggesting no particular measure in relation to American Pro-Slavery clergymen. It was evident, however, that the spirit of the meeting demanded something more definite than this, and the following Resolution was carried by acclamation:

That this Assembly, while most anxious to reciprocate sentiments of fraternal regard and unity towards the pastors and churches in the United States of the same faith and order as the churches in connexion with this Union—more especially to the descendants of the venerated Pilgrim Fathers in the New England States—deem it their duty to renew their solemn and indignant protest against Slavery as still existing among the American churches; and, in particular, to expess their their great surprise and deep regret at the conduct of those ministers of various denominations who have given either their direct countenance or their tacit support to the Fugitive Slave Law recently passed by the American Legislature; inasmuch as they cannot but regard that wicked and accursed statute as being, in the language of the eminent patriot and philanthropist, Judge Jay, 'a palpable violation of the principles of justice, the rights of humanity, and the religion of Jesus Christ;' a statute in which no one who would obey God rather than man can consistently or righteously submit. And this Assembly earnestly pray, that it may please the Divine Head of the Church, in whom there is neither bond nor free, to open the eyes of the ministers and churches in the United States to the aggravated guilt of participating in the sin of man-stealing, or holding their brethren in unjust and cruel bondage, which creates, in the judgment of this Union, an insuperable barrier to Christian fellowship with them on the part of all who reverence the authority of God and respect the inalienable rights of their fellow men.

The *Christian Inquirer* of this city, and the *Christian Register* of Boston, the organs of the Unitarians in this country, studiously exclude from their columns the various Resolutions of this character passed by different Societies of that denomination abroad. We believe, however, it is rather a fear of increasing the Anti-Slavery spirit of the members of that body here, than of offending a Pro-Slavery spirit, which governs those papers.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN IRELAND.

The *London Times* of the 6th inst. Contains the following report of an Anti-Slavery meeting held a few days before in Cork, Ireland. The Report from the *Times* has found its way into two or three of our city daily papers, so that the work marked out for the Secretaries, to have the Resolutions published extensively in this country, is done to his hand:

AMERICAN FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW. At a MEETING of the Cork Anti-Slavery Society, held at Lloyd's Hotel May 27, 1851.

JAMES LAMBKIN, Esq, Mayor of Cork, in the chair. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Proposed by Andrew F. Roche, Alderman, J. P., seconded by Alexander King, Independent Minister:

Resolved, 1. That we have observed with pain and sorrow the course pursued by the Legislature of the United States with reference to Slavery, and hereby express our deep abhorrence of some of its recent enactments, more especially the iniquitous Fugitive Slave Law passed during last session of Congress, which affords so strong an evidence of the continued and determined opposition of that Government to a course consistent with justice and mercy, that we cannot but consider it a wilful perseverance in an unrighteous system which has been long proved to be not less at variance with the soundest principles of enlightened policy, than repugnant to the plainest obligations of morality and religion.

Proposed by Richard Dowden, (Bd.) Alderman, seconded by Nicholas Peterson:

Resolved, That we desire to express our hearty sympathy with the millions of our oppressed fellow men, still held in chains in that land of boasted freedom, as well as with the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause throughout America, whom we would fain cheer on in their arduous struggle on behalf of suffering humanity amid the difficulties and perils which surround them; and earnestly beseech our fellow professors of the Christian name in that country to put away from them this enormous evil and to afford every assistance to those noble-minded men who are laboring to efface from the national escutcheon so deep and foul a stain.

Proposed by Wm. Deeble, seconded by Farmer Lloyd:

Resolved, 3. That these resolutions be advertised in each of the three leading Cork papers, as well as in a leading journal in Dublin and London; and that the Secretary be directed to take steps to have them published as extensively as possible in the United States newspaper press, and also transmit a copy to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

JAMES LAMBKIN, Mayor of Cork, Chairman.
SAMUEL BEALE, Secretary.
Cork, May 30, 1851.

THE BOSTON COMMONWEALTH.—Mr. Bird, the editor of the *Commonwealth* for some time past, takes leave of his readers, in a late number, in a graceful and modest valedictory, and announces that hereafter his place will be occupied by Mr Joseph Lyman, assisted by the Hon. John G Palfrey. Valuable as Mr. Bird has made the paper as the organ of the Free Soil Party of Massachusetts, it bids fair to be no less so under its new conductors. Its editorials are able, candid, and dignified, and the editors seem determined that there shall be no mistake as to the issue involved in the Free Soil movement. The success of the party, as far as success is possible, is far more probable under such a course, which must disarm its opponents of some of their weapons, than under one which confounds Abolitionism and Free Soilism.

THE *Pennsylvania Freeman* of last week says that we were mistaken in supposing that any apprehensions of a mob prevented Geo. Thompson from speaking in Delavan Hall on the 8th. His friends did not desire him to speak there, as the hall could not contain a tenth part of the people who had assembled. We got our information from the Telegraphic reports to the daily papers, but are glad to be assured of its incorrectness. We should be still more glad if some of the friends of the cause in Philadelphia were as anxious to send us the truth in such a case as its enemies are to send lies to other papers.

DOMESTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. LXXXII.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Thompson Festival—Its success—By whom suggested and carried out—The Assembly Hall—The Committee of Arrangements—The Tickets—The premiums—Reception of Mr. Thompson—The Scene—Mr. Garrison's Address—His Reply—Other Speakers—The Small Hours—The measureless content—Lewis Hayden's trial—Over strong swearing—Novelties in Optics—Effects of Colors—Commissioner Curtis on complexions—Attorney Lunt makes out that black is sometimes white—Office of United States Witness—Mr. Buffum also stateth a fact—His experience as a Witness—His Philosophical disquisition on Hogsheads—Disagreement of Jury—Danger of the Union—Hayden at the Thompson Supper while the jury were under lock and key—Mr. Morris's case.—A malignant Juror.—A new objection to a juror—The trial postponed—Judge Sprague's Court room and the Black Hole at Calcutta—His state of health and its consequences—The Virtue of Resignation hinted at—Its rarity—The Counsel for the Defence, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, June 23d, 1851.

You will have received ere this, such full accounts of the Entertainment given in honor of Mr. Thompson, this night week, that it is hardly necessary that I should add anything to them. Suffice it to to say that it was a perfect Success, and that there seemed nothing to be desiderated. The Assembly Hall, over the Worcester Dépot, is perhaps the largest in the City and very handsomely fitted up and lighted for the purposes for which it was designed. It was at first thought to be a risk almost too great to be run, to propose holding the Festival in so large a place. But the result justified the wisdom of the Committee of Arrangements in their decision. The Entertainment, as you know, was suggested by the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, and the Massachusetts Society charged with carrying it out. The Managers of that Society performed its task by means of the indefatigable and judicious Committee to whom the details were entrusted. All the arrangements were planned and carried out in the very best manner by them and by Mr. Joshua B. Smith who furnished the collation. All doubt as to the expediency of having engaged the largest hall to be had was at an end long before the day arrived. The enthusiasm with which the proposition was hailed reached far and wide. The tickets were nearly all gone before the day arrived, and all were disposed of long before the night came. Premiums were offered and paid to the fortunate holders in some cases. And there were rumors of as much as Five Dollars being offered for one. A good deal of disappointment was occasioned to persons who had come from a considerable distance in the certain hope of finding room enough in so large a place, but who were unavoidably excluded. In fact, it was quite a Jenny Lind affair.

The company began to arrive about seven o'clock, an hour before the time fixed for the Chair to be taken. As the parties arrived they were placed by the Committee of Arrangements, so that parties were seated together and without any confusion or difficulty. At 8 o'clock, when the officers and invited guests entered the Hall, every seat (more than a thousand in number) was filled. Mr. Thompson was greeted on his entrance, and when he took his place on the platform with the most enthusiastic cheers. The scene was an exceedingly beautiful and impressive one. The great assembly, half of which was made up of women, the well spread tables, the brilliant light, the universal cheerfulness and pleasure which was obvious upon every countenance, made up an uncommonly fine picture. Besides the guests that had seats, two or three hundred were admitted who occupied all the vacant standing room around the hall, so that the whole space was occupied with interested and delighted faces. The tables were abundantly and elegantly spread, and there was enough and to spare for all. After the sacred rage of hunger had been satisfied and the President had briefly stated the purpose of the meeting and the auspices under which it was held, concluding with the health of our guest, which was interrupted and welcomed with the most rapturous cheers and plaudits, Mr. Garrison read a well written and well considered Address to Mr. Thompson, on behalf of the Abolitionists of America. This, I presume you will lay before your readers.

After Mr. Garrison had concluded his Address, Mr. Thompson rose and again had a Reception such as was a Reception. Cheer followed cheer, and it seemed as if they would never cease sufficiently to allow him to be heard. He was evidently much affected by the tone of the Address and by the feeling manifested towards him by the auditory, and as soon as he was permitted to go on, spoke for more than an hour and a half, frequently interrupted by vociferous applause. I shall attempt no sketch of this oration, as it will appear in *The Liberator* from the notes of Mr. J. F. W. Yerrinton, who has proved himself a match for the most experienced phonographers by the fulness, accuracy, and spirit with which he has rendered the proceedings of that night. Mr. Wendell Phillips, Mr. Remond, the Hon. Edward L. Keyes, of the Senate, the Rev. Theodore Parker, the Hon. Rodney French and Mr. J. N. Buffum, and perhaps one or two others, spoke with great effect in the very best of their respective styles. Several other distinguished gentlemen were present, who could not be called upon from want of time. The party remained together, almost entirely unbroken until the close, which was in the neighborhood of the small hours of the morning. I believe all departed " shut up in measureless content," quite satisfied that they had had all they had reckoned on and more. It was an occasion justly gratifying to Mr. Thompson and to all his friends, and formed a fit contrast to his first greeting in Faneuil Hall. It is, perhaps, but just to say that Marshal Tukey sent out a strong force of policemen, of his own motion, to secure the meeting from disturbance, which was put under the entire control of Mr. Smith, but there was no occasion for their interposition.

The trial of Lewis Hayden has been the other matter of general and particular interest, since I wrote to you last. You have rejoiced with us in the knowledge of the disagreement of the jury in his case as in that of Scott. The case looked rather badly at one time, the government witnesses swore " so uncommon strong." Only it happened that they rather over-did their business and swore so strong that it went rather against the stomach of the sense of the jury to believe such swift testimony. Several interesting facts in optics were elicited at this trial, as to the nature and effect of colors. Mr. Commissioner George T. Curtis, commonly known as the Little Expounder, who was the examining magistrate in the case of Shadrach, distinguished himself by his acumen in this branch of natural science. At the previous trial, he had sworn that the man who exhorted poor Shadrach to be of good cheer, which crime the government was attempting to fasten upon Hayden, was *a tall light-complexioned* colored man. Now, as you know, Hayden is *not* tall, and *is* as black as the Ace of Spades. This being a critical point of the case, the Little Expounder, with an intrepidity that did him honor, when asked to look at the defendant and say whether he was the offender in question, declared " the inclination of his opinion to be that he *was!*" The apparent discrepancy between the two statements was admirably reconciled by " young Mr. Lunt," the District Attorney, by the statement of " the well known fact " that " a black coat sometimes looks white!" I was not present, but this was the report of this scientific discussion which was made to me. It has been suggested, however, that the skill thus evinced by Mr. Curtis may have an unfortunate effect upon his fortunes. It is generally believed that it is his wish to displace poor Mr Lunt in the District Attorneyship. But after his late display of talent on the witness-stand, it is the general opinion of the Bar that the Government will prefer employing him as a *Witness*.

Mr. Buffum, on the other side, stated facts with great effect. I do not now recollect the precise point to which he was called, but the *gist* of his evidence was a conversation held between himself, Mr. Lunt and Mr. Hallet, after one of the sessions of one of the preliminary examinations in these Rescue Cases. I have an idea or, to borrow the words of Mr. Curtis, " the inclination of my opinion " is that I gave you an account of this interview in a former letter. At any rate, Mr. Lunt was extremely incensed at the tenor of his evidence, and protested against it as intended as a personal insult to himself. Most of it was ruled in, however, and what was ruled out he managed to get before the jury, greatly to the diversion of all except the Representative of the Union. Mr. Buffum has before signalized himself as a witness. On one occasion, he was under cross-examination by a Mr. Lord, brother of the assistant of Mr. Lunt in these cases. Mr. Lord did his best to perplex and browbeat him so as to overset the testimony he had given against his client. The question was something relating to machinery, and Mr. Buffum had used the word " philosophically " in his evidence. Mr. Lord continually harped upon this phrase, and endeavored to make the witness ridiculous in the eyes of the jury. At last, he enquired, " pray, Mr. Witness, as you seem to be a great philosopher, can you tell me what the consequence would be if the air should be exhausted from a hogshead?" " Yes, sir," replied Mr. Buffum, " the head would fall in." " Indeed, sir!" pursued the counsel, " and can you tell me, *philosophically*, why the head should fall in first?" " Yes, sir," returned Mr. Buffum, " it is because hogsheads are like some lawyers—*their heads are their weakest part!*" The roar of the Court-room acknowledged the victory of the witness over the counsel; and if the learned gentleman were not known thenceforward, by way of distinction, by the *soubriquet* of " Hogshead Lord," it was not for want of an occasion.

I had great satisfaction in being present on the morning when the jury came in with no verdict, and in watching the countenances of Judge Sprague, who had preordained a conviction, and of the counsel for the government. It was a heavy blow and great discouragement to the Webster Whigs. The trial by jury must go next in order to save the Union and preserve the Constitution. The jury in this case was kept together for about twenty-four hours, but neither waking nor sleeping could they be made to agree. At the Thompson Supper, which was the night the jury were kept together, Wendell Phillips remarked upon it as a good sign that " the jury were locked up and Lewis Hayden at liberty and with us that night!" At the request of the President, Hayden presented himself to the company, and was received by them with great warmth, and they cordially responded to the wish that God would send him a good deliverance! The Court next took up the case of Robert Morris, Esq, the colored lawyer, and after some difficulty found a jury. After the trial had proceeded for some time, Mr. Lunt discovered that one of the jury had expressed opinions adverse to the Fugitive Law. The next morning he brought witnesses to that effect, and the Judge set him aside, although he had declared on the *voir dire* that he entertained no opinions which would prevent him from returning a verdict of guilty upon the facts, if proved to his satisfaction. A state of mind entirely consistent with strong disapprobation of the Law. The day before, Judge Sprague ordered a witness to stand aside for saying that he felt a general sympathy with the Oppressed everywhere! It is supposed that at the next trial the question on the *voir dire* will be, " Do you entertain any opinions which will prevent you from convicting the prisoner, whether you think him guilty or not?" Mr. Hale, indeed, insisted on his farther examination; but had it not been for his interposition, the juror would have been set aside for this statement! This consumed so much time that the trial was postponed, inasmuch as the jury would die a natural death on the next Tuesday, unless continued in life by the consent of both parties. To this the defendant's counsel declined to consent. The trial might have been finished within the term, if the Court could sit in the afternoons. But you must know that Judge Sprague, in addition to all his other qualifications for his station, is a confirmed invalid, and is unable to hold afternoon sessions. And not only so, but he is unable to bear a breath of fresh air, so that any one would pay a handsome difference to exchange from his Court-room to the Black Hole at Calcutta. Under these circumstances, you cannot be surprised that a general opinion should prevail that, as there is no probability of his complete recovery, and as he has no immediate intention of dying, he should do the only other thing that would do justice to the suitors and practitioners in his Court—viz., *resign*. But that, you know, is a thing Judges and general officers never do. The counsel for the defendants in these cases, Messrs. John P. Hale and Richard H. Dana, Jr., have done themselves, both personally and professionally, the highest honor by the manner in which they have conducted the defences in these State Trials—the most important in their bearings that have ever taken place in the country.—D. Y.

Miscellaneous News.

——ON the 24th of May, the Duchess of Sutherland entertained, at Strafford House, Mrs. Maria Weston Chapman, Miss Weston and Mrs. Follen, widow of the late distinguished Dr. Charles Follen, of Boston, together with a distinguished company among whom were the Earl of Carlisle, the Duchess of Argyle, &c.

——" OLD LINE " DEMOCRACY IN VERMONT.—The " old line " Democratic convention for the county of Washington, in Vermont, on the 10th June, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Fugitive Slave Law is constitutional, but we regard it as a child of Whig parentage, and are willing to allow that party its honors, profits, and emoluments; and that it is unwise, impolitic, and foolish for Democrats to use it as a fire brand to divide their own party; that we intend to take high, national constitutional ground in relation thereto, and know no North or South, but as peaceable, law-abiding democrats, obey and carry out its provisions as long as it remains the law of the land

——EDITOR SHOT.—A woman of slight frame, about forty-five years of age, recently entered the office of the *Southern Banner*, at Athens, Geo., and inquired for the editor. Being told that he was absent she walked up to the desk of the publisher, Mr. Reynolds, and taking up a type asked him 'are these types?' drew a pistol and shot him, wounding him dangerously. The woman was armed with two large rifle-bored pistols, and a large glittering bowie knife. The ground of the attack was the alleged publication, in the *Banner*, of an article charging the female in question with having appeared in man's clothing. The editor affirms that no such article ever appeared in his columns.—*The Garrard Banner.*

——THE NEW DISPENSATION.—Attorney-General Lunt, in the course of his plea in the Shadrach rescue case in Boston, expounds the gospel according to Saint Hunker, as follows:

" No, gentlemen, rely upon it, the path of virtue and duty is a somewhat beaten track; and they who undertake to serve God or man in any other modes than those most ordinary and approved, scarcely know what they are about."

The gospel according to St. Mathew reads somewhat differently:

" Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because, strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

Matthew, however, and even Jesus, whose words he gives us, are but poor authority with those who think the salvation of the Union depends upon making the Northern people slave-catchers.—*Tribune*.

——THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY AMONG THE UNIVERSALISTS.—At the State Convention of Universalists held at Chicopee on Wednesday the 4th inst., a series of resolutions reported by the Business Committee, of which Rev. E. G. Brooks, of Lynn, was chairman, were discussed and adopted with great unanimity. The fourth Resolution refers to Slavery, and is as follows:

Resolved, That we renewedly protest against Slavery and the insolent encroachments of the Slave Power in this country; and especially do we protest against the recent Fugitive Slave Law, believing it a denial of the holiest rights of man and the plainest principles of duty, unworthy a Christian people, entitled to no obedience, and demanding immediate repeal.

——THE NEW RING OF SATURN.—We had occasion to announce in *The Traveller*, on the 16th of November last, that the Messrs. Bond, the Astronomers at the Cambridge Observatory, had ascertained beyond all doubt, the existence of a *third* ring around the planet Saturn. The new ring, at the time of its discovery, was well observed and carefully defined; and subsequent observations have confirmed the deductions first made The same appearances noticed at the Cambridge Observatory, were afterwards observed by Messrs. Dawes and Lassel, in England. The honor of the discovery belongs to Messrs. Bond, under whose faithful and intelligent labors, the great Equatorial at Cambridge has already made many important contributions to this department of astronomical science. The eighth satellite of Saturn, it will be remembered, was discovered by Mr. Bond, about two years ago.

——A CORRESPONDENT of the *Albany Journal* writing from Sandy Hill, says that the Baptist Association, numbering over a hundred preachers and lay members, closed its session at that place last week. The following Resolution was adopted by the Association:

Resolved, That the entire system of American Slavery is a flagrant violation of the principles of humanity and justice, and at war with our holy Religion, and is as separate from Christianity as light from darkness.

——THE HUTCHINSONS AT ST. LOUIS.—The Hutchinsons were not permitted to sing at St. Louis. Wyman's Hall, after having been engaged, was closed against them by the proprietor, and Mr. Mayor Kennett sanctioned the deed. Mr. Wyman is a Massachusetts man. When a Yankee falls, he sinks deep. Plummet line cannot reach him. We know enough of the people of St. Louis to assure Mr. Wyman that this closing of his doors against the Hutchinsons will prove an unprofitable speculation for *him*. A portion of the press of St. Louis prostituted itself on the occasion.—*Chicago Tribune*.

——THE current of the spontaneous movement in the nieghborhood of Boston, does not flow smoothly. A man who would not sign the paper got up to subscribe Webster into the Presidency, has been discharged by the agent of the Middlesex mill. The Lowell *American* says, that the man was a Whig, but not a Websterite. The circumstances were these, as they appear by the statements of the Lowell *Courier* on the one side, and the Lowell *American* on the other.

The man took a pen and wrote under the names of some of the signers—" Not by a d—d sight." He immediately admitted that he had done wrong, erased the words with a knife, and made an apology to the person who had charge of the paper. The fellow, however, another of his class, reported the matter to the agent of the mills, who immediately administered summary vengeance. The Lowell *Courier*, which attempts to excuse this tyrannical proceeding, says:

" He dismissed the man at once, *not* for not signing but for insulting in so decent a manner, those who did sign—and further, he refused to receive any apology whatever for so gross an insult."

If these are the methods resorted to in order to procure subscribers to Mr. Webster's paper, it is very possible that a few thousand names may be got. The Lowell *American* makes the following estimate of the number of names procured thus far by the different influences at work—admiration of Mr. Webster, solicitation, and the fear of loss of employment-

" It is said that a couple of thousand have signed in Boston, five hundred in Lowell, two hundred in Salem, four hundred in Dorchester, &c., &c There are on the check-lists of the towns and cities of this State, the names of 180,000 voters; it is possible that at the present time five thousand have signed the Webster pledge. Perhaps twenty thousand may be obtained by a great effort. Yet this goes by the name of a 'spontaneous movement!' The subscription to pay Webster $40,000 for taking the office of Secretary of State, might as well be called spontaneous. Many people sign the paper without any intention of ever *voting* for the candidate. They sign out of politeness to the man who carries round the paper, in like manner as a German in this city sat upon the anxious seat at a revival meeting, because, as he said, the preacher was so urgent, and nobody else would comply with his request; so he did it, merely *out of politeness!*"—*Post*.

——THE *Greenville* (S. C.) *Patriot* says the largest number of slaveholders in that State are against secession, while the small holders are for it.

——ONE of the Lowell girls, employed in a cotton mill at Columbus in Georgia, writes home that the mill was intolerably dirty, and unprovided with a single looking glass, and that ' nearly all the girls chew tobacco. They have a small stick, nearly as large as a pipe stem, one end of which they chew until it is something like a brush, then they dip it in snuff, put it in their mouths and suck it like a babe. They pay twenty-five cents a bottle for snuff, one of which will last them a week.'

——THE *Boston Courier* has the following instance of spontaneity:

'*The Webster Call.*—In one large manufacturing and merchantile establishment in this city, fourty-four names were spontaneously obtained yesterday to the Webster nomination.'

Spontaneously is good!

In another establishment that we know of, out of seventy workmen, who were applied to, two of them signed and sixty-eight spontaneously did not.—*Commonwealth*.

——THE following is from a correspondence of the New York *Herald*:

" I will close this letter with an anecdote, known to be true, which has been all the talk here in American circles: ' There is no disputing about tastes,' said an ancient maker of apothegms. This truth is exemplified in the sentiment of the good people of merry England, as well as that of certain people at home, towards the sable sons and daughters of Africa. An incident, which occurred here a day or two since, to a brace of Yankee gentlemen, one an honorable and the other a general, exhibits this sentiment on the part of the ladies and gentlemen here very forcibly. When I use the term Yankee, I do so in its generic sense, one of the gentlemen in question being from your city and the other from a Southern State. New York is not, I believe, within the limits of the empire of Yankee Doodl'em proper, which is confined to the New England States

Some kind *virtuosi* of the English aristocracy, male and female, were enacting the part of *ciceroni* to the two Brothers Johnathan, and explaining to them all the wonders of London, and, among the other amazing sights, led them to a gallery of statues and busts of eminent men of all countries. Peel, Canning, Pitt, Fox, Brougham, &c. were pointed out, as were also Washington, Jackson, Jefferson and Franklin and many others One was shown as the bust of the celebrated Mister Douglass of America. ' Let me look at it,' exclaimed one of my countrymen, ' I know Senator Douglass well—he is a particular friend of mine—I go for him for next President.' ' Let me see, too, said the General, ' I go for him too—he is a great man for his inches.' They both rushed forward—the crowd around the bust gave way—and our two friends came near the work of art, when lo! and behold! it was a marble bust of * * * FRED. DOUGLASS.

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER.—Our fellow citizen, Hiram Ketchum, has been invited to make a 4th of July oration at New Haven, and in a note which we find in the New Haven Journal, he says:

' I accept the invitation.—This is the first time I have ever consented to deliver a 4th of July oration, and it ill-suits my convenience now; but the time has come in my judgment, when every republican in the land ought profoundly to consider the duties of an American citizen—and if he has anything to say, to communicate it when a fitting occasion presents'

It is gratifying to know that Mr. Ketchum has finally resolved for one, ' profoundly to consider the duties of an American citizen,' it is only a pity that he should have put it off so long. Mr. Ketchum thinks he shall feel great diffidence in speaking before an audience in so intellectual a place as New Haven, where there are so many professors, and he might have added where the editor of the *Journal of Commerce* spends his Sundays, but with the heroic determination of the Western captain, who swore he would ' beat that boat or bust,' Mr. Ketchum adds, ' I shall do the best my circumstance allows.'—*Post*.

——SLAVES.—A series of letters has appeared in the National Intelligencer, written by Dr. Drake, of Cincinnati, and addressed to Dr. Warren, of Boston. A most decided statement is made in the first letter respecting the improved condition of the slaves. He says, they " are better fed, clothed and lodged; less severely punished; receive more religious training; and in all respects are more cared for than they were forty, thirty or even twenty years ago."

——THE MAINE GOLD MINES.—The *Bangor Whig* of Friday says, that one of the citizens of that place, who started some time since for the Maine gold regions, with provisions for one month, has returned and declared upon his honor, that after laborious digging and faithful search, he found no gold, and the numerous company that for several weeks have been operating there, have not realized 10 cents a day each.

——CONVICTION FOR INTENT TO KIDNAP.—In the Boston Municipal Court on Saturday, Julian McCrea and B. F. Roberts (both colored) were found guilty upon the charge of assault with intent to kidnap Thomas P. Smith, a very respectable colored man, who gave offense to some of his colored brethren by opposing the abolition of separate schools for colored children. The offense is a very serious one, and was committed under very aggravated circumstances.

——LETTER FROM CASSIUS M. CLAY.—The following letter was addressed by Mr. Clay to a Committee of Free Soilers in Maine:

WHITEHALL, Madison Co., Ky., May 20, 1851.

GENTLEMEN:—Your favor of the last month is received. It would give me great pleasure to be present with you on the 4th of July next as proposed, did circumstances allow. But I am canvassing the State with a view of organizing an Anti-Slavery party in Kentucky. I think I can be more usefully though far less agreeably employed here.

Allow me to say, however, that I regard this contest as embracing the liberty or slavery of all, white and black. Of course it cannot be an issue between North and South, but between the slaveholding aristocracy of the South and the large shipping merchants and cotton dealers in the North, on the one hand, and the great non-slaveholding masses of the whole Union on the other.

Our fathers of '76 knew well that Liberty and Slavery could not coexist—there was declared a truce, but no permanent peace was made or anticipated. Jefferson embodied their sentiments in his letter to Ed. Cole of Illinois, contending that they of '76 but began the vindication of our liberties by the Revolutionary war—that it remained to us, the descendants of the patriots of that day, to complete our liberties by the overthrow of Slavery.

Slavery, so far from becoming extinct as Mr. Madison and others believed, in consequence of which they would not leave the word " slave " on record in the Constitution of '88, has strengthened itself and carried on an agressive war in the slave and free States.

In South Carolina the great mass of the laboring class are about to be precipitated into a revolution without being heard by the ballot in their own behalf! The liberty of Northern Anti-Slavery men in Slave States is impossible. The United States Constitution is overthrown by the Fugitive Slave Law! By that, persons now free in free States are returned into Slavery which was inflicted on some remote ancestors—" portus sequitur ventrem."

The Slave party with a high hand tramples down all the principles and usages of such liberty even, as aristocracies and limited monarchies have for many centuries enjoyed. I said one year ago to the members of the New York Legislature that the American people were slaves! I was set down as a fanatic! How now?!!

No, we must arouse ourselves at once, or we are lost. Such men as Webster and Dickinson in the North are traitors to freedom; they must be put down! In the South, the masters must learn that Slave States are not made up only of masters and slaves—but that another class, the great white laboring masses, must begin to be estimated in political calculations.

The Government everywhere must be put upon the free tack! The cry must be once more, " liberty or death!" till, in the land of the free, men shall have equal rights! Your friend, C. M. CLAY.

Messrs. Jeff. Maybury, and others, Committee.

——CHIEF JUSTICE HORNBLOWER PRONOUNCES THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.—We are permitted to make the following extract from a letter from Chief Justice Hornblower, to Senator Chase, dated Newark, N. J., April 9, 1851:

" Somewhere about the year 1836, a fugitive slave came before us, upon a Habeas Corpus, allowed by me, (and as it was a few days before our regular term) made returnable at bar. On that occasion (when no such excitement existed as now prevails,) I wrote an opinion, to the effect, that 1st, Congress had no authority to legislate on the subject; secondly, whether Congress had such power or not, no man could be deprived of a trial by Jury, when his personal identity, his age, his ownership of himself, and his obligation to serve another as his slave, were in issue. The opinion was not read by me from the bench (though the amount of it was orally stated by me,) because it became unnecessary, my associate Justices uniting with me in opinion, that the Magistrate had no right to " commit " the man claimed as a slave, as he had done, to the custody of the *Sheriff*, for safe keeping, until his master came for him, our jails not being built for the safe keeping of any man's slaves, but for criminals only.—*Toledo (O) Republican*.

——A COLD SHOULDER TO BOSTON.—We copy the following from the Georgia Constitutionalist:

A BOSTON DRUMMER.—A friend has handed us a card of a Boston dry goods house, that of J. M. Beebe, Morgan & Co., which an agent for them, who is on a Southern drumming expedition, has been distributing in Augusta. We give this house the full benefit of this advertisement, in our editorial columns, gratis. But we accompany it with the expression of our astonishment of the cool assurance which would prompt any Boston man to come to the South on any such expedition. It is to be hoped the Southern people have got enough of Boston, and the less they have to do with her hereafter, the better. Both Boston, as a city, and Massachusetts, as a State, have shown themselves entitled to but little of the sympathy of the Southern people. We should make as few contracts as possible with a people who show so little disposition to carry out the great contract of the Constitution, in letter and spirit. Practical non-intercourse with them is alike a measure of good policy and of retributive justice.

MARRIAGES.

WATTS—MINTURN.—On Thursday, 19th inst., by the Rev. Samuel Cooke, of St. Bartholemew's Church, Ridley Watts to Sarah Minturn, daughter of Henry Grinnell.

LIVINGSTON—MORRIS.—At Dover, Dutchess county, N. Y., on June 6th, Jaspar Livingston, of the Manor of Livingston, to Mathilde, youngest daughter of Sir John Morris, of Sketty Park, Glamorganshire, Bart., and grand-daughter of the late Lord Torrington.

DEATHS.

SEDGWICK.—In this city On the 17th inst., in the 15th year of her age, Helen E., daughter of the late Robert Sedgwick, of this city.

LANSING.—In this city 14th instant, Susan Frances, wife of Rev. D. C. Lansing, D. D.

COGGESHALL.—In this city Elizabeth Coggeshall, widow of Caleb Coggeshall, in the 82d year of her age, for many years a minister in the Society of Friends.

KENT.—Thursday, the 19th instant, at Orange, N. J., at the residence of her son-in-law, Isaac S. Hone, Esq, Mrs. Elizabeth Kent, widow of the late Chancellor Kent, in the 83d year of her age.

SULLIVAN.—In Savannah, Ga., 9th inst., Mrs S. W. Sullivan, relict of the late Hon. William Sullivan, of Boston.

GRAND CELEBRATION,

IN MASS MEETING, ON

INDEPENDENCE DAY.

THE Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in accordance with established usage, hereby notify the friends of impartial and universal liberty throughout the Commonwealth, that they have made arrangements for a GRAND CELEBRATION of the approaching Anniversary of American Independence, in the beautiful and spacious

GROVE AT ABINGTON,

having for its direct, appropriate and beneficient object the liberation of the millions of slaves, who, on that day, will be clanking their galling fetters and sending their cries to Heaven, in this guilty land—a land unmatched for its tyranny, and unparalleled for its hypocrisy.

A special train of cars will leave the station, corner of South and Kneeland streets, at half-past 8 o'clock, A. M. Tickets half price.

THE EIGHTEENTH NATIONAL

ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

TO BE HELD IN BOSTON, MASS., DURING THE CHRISTMAS WEEK OF 1851.

IN ADDRESSING the Friends of the Anti-Slavery Cause at the present time, and in once more seeking their aid and co-operation, the Bazaar Committee feel more deeply than ever before not only the necessity for such aid and co-operation, but an entire assurance that no representations nor arguments are needed on their part to secure both in a fuller measure than on any previous occasion.

The crime that has recently been perpetrated in our midst in the re-enslavement of an innocent man, effected as it has been by the help, connivance and sympathy of the magistrates, merchants and churches of Boston, exhibits a state of things which must supply to every heroic and conscientious person such motive for exertion as no word, however eloquent, could furnish.

Indeed, all human language seems inadequate to depict the condition of a nation such as ours. Only in the language of prophets and apostles can its guilt be made truly to appear. The fearful descriptions of apostate Israel, making ' many prayers' with hands ' full of blood,' seeking how best to unite robbery and burnt offering, may be, without fanaticism or exaggeration, strictly applied to this community and the nation of which it makes a part. Can we arrive at a more charitable judgment, when remembering that three millions of men and women, as good in the sight of God as their enslavers, their improvement, happiness and salvation as dear in His sight, are held as goods and chattels by a people professing not a mere nominal and historical Christianity, but holding, by an immense majority, to those tenets which claim and maintain the title of evangelical? It is the guilt and shame of this nation not only that it is a slaveholding one, but that at the same time it claims as its own the names Republican and Christian. The life-long misery of millions of slaves is not her chief condemnation. It is, that the light within her having become darkness, she is in reality the ally and supporter of every form of oppression, despotism and heathenism the world over. The fact that great material prosperity exists through our whole country, and that amid a large minority the fruits of virtue and morality abound, does not invalidate this statement. We may better learn from the teachings of past History how a people corrupt as powerful affects the world's destinies than from the narrow field of mere personal experience.

In view of truths like these, we would trust that with ourselves and all co-operating with us, the spirit of labor and self-sacrifice may be increased ten-fold, so that the success of this special effort may prove in some degree commensurate with the increased perils and responsibilities of our position.

Should this appeal meet the eyes of any hitherto indifferent or opposed to Anti-Slavery principles, to such we would say, ' The Abolition of Slavery is as truly your duty as ours.' If you have never felt the claims of humanity before, respond to them now. In the belief which we entertain and the action flowing therefrom, we appeal for our justification to the teachings of the New Testament, to the recorded testimony of all by-gone ages as to the value of freedom and the villany of Slavery, and finally to the secret consciousness of every human heart. You *know* that you would spurn and reject Slavery for yourself or those dear to you.—Do you not blush, then, if money or ambition, or high standing in a pro-slavery and by consequence an apostate church, shall have hitherto led you to actively aid or ignore the enslavement of others?

We turn with undoubting confidence to those friends in Europe, who have sympathized so truly with us, and have in so unwearied a manner shown their faith by their works. We are laboring for the destruction of a system which is the enemy of human nature every where, the opponent of civilization, the foe of all just government, the corrupter and uprooter of Christianity in every nation where it exists. Under these circumstances, we feel at liberty to ask the aid of all of every clime, race or creed, to whom justice, humanity and freedom are words dear and sacred. We rejoice to recognize a spirit higher and holier than any feeling of nationality, uniting all who labor together from unselfish motives for the promotion of an object noble and heroic as ours—the abolition of the vilest system of Slavery the sun ever saw, by the entire and uncompromising utterance of *the truth* alone.

ANNE WARREN WESTON,
ANN GREENE PHILLIPS,
HELEN E. GARRISON,
MARY GRAY CHAPMAN,
MARY MAY,
SARAH R. MAY,
CATHARINE SARGENT,
HENRIETTA SARGENT,
HANNAH TUFTS,
FRANCES MARY ROBBINS,
THANKFUL SOUTHWICK,
SARAH H. SOUTHWICK,
CAROLINE F. WILLIAMS,
MARY H. JACKSON,
ELIZABETH GAY,
CHARLOTTE S. SARGENT,
LOUISA LORING,
SARAH S. RUSSELL,
MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN,
ELIZA LEE FOLLEN,
SUSAN C. CABOT,
CAROLINE WESTON,
SARAH B. SHAW,
ELIZA F. EDDY,
MARY WILLEY,
EVELINA A. S. SMITH,
ANN R. BRAMHALL,
LYDIA PARKER,
MARIA LOWELL,
ABBY FRANCIS,
ELIZABETH A. COTTON.

Boston, May 21, 1851.

TO THE LOVERS OF LIBERTY.

DEAR FRIENDS: Owing to a change of time for Commencement, the ANNUAL RHODE ISLAND ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR will be held in this city, (Providence) on Wednesday, July 9th, (*Commencement Day*), of 1851.

Once more we make an appeal for assistance. We are more needy than ever. The calls upon us for aid, are more numerous and pressing than ever. The friends all understand full well, that our ability is proportionate to their kindness and liberality. *Without you, we can do nothing.* Accept thanks for past favors.

Since our last Annual Fair, the infamous " Fugitive Slave Act," has gone into operation. This has rendered a redoubling of effort necessary, to awaken the public conscience to succor the fugitives already with us, and to provide for those who may yet come. The blood hounds are abroad, and are scenting their prey in our free New England. Those who are set for the establishment of Justice are bowing their necks beneath the yoke of Slavery. In our very sight, as it were, by *northern men*, the shackles have been riveted upon our brother's limbs, and he has been dragged back to the most abhorrent bondage the world ever saw. That such enormities may not be committed in Rhode Island—that we may be able to succor and shelter and protect the sons of oppression, as God shall send them to us, we ask you, friends, to contribute to our Fair. Nay, it is not *we* that ask, but the defenceless, the needy, the oppressed—'tis humanity—'tis God. Listen and give—give liberally—even as if *you* were in bondage. Let every one give SOMETHING—*give as much as he can*. A little—nay—a great deal of self-denial—that we may increase our ability—will do us good and " help the cause along."

Any requisite information may be obtained by addressing *Amarancy Paine, Anti-Slavery Office, No. 18 Eddy street*. Contributions and donations may be deposited in the same place, or with either of the following persons.

Susan R. Harris, Providence,
Mary R. Clarke, "
Rebecca R. M. C. Capron, "
Lucretia Francis, "
Elizabeth H. Smith, "
Olive Taber, "
Parthena P. Janes, "
Anna M. Scott, "
Sarah Gould, Coventry,
Mary Anthony, "
Mary H. Adams, East Greenwich,
Sarah J. Brown, "
Mary W. Greene, Apponaug,
Rebecca P. Aldrich, Gloucester,
Betsey F. Lawton, Chepachet,
Joanna K. Ballou, Cumberland,
Sophia L. Little, Newport,
Caroline A. Robbins, "
Ann F. Wescott, N. Providence,
Francis Clark, "
Priscilla Coffin, Olneyville.

THE BRITISH PERIODICALS

AND THE

FARMER'S GUIDE.

Liberal Offers to New Subscribers!

LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,

No. 54 Gold Street, New York,

CONTINUE to publish the four leading British Quarterly Reviews and Blackwood's Magazine; in addition to which they have recently commenced the publication of a valuable Agricultural work, called the

" Farmer's Guide to Scientific and Practical Agriculture."

By HENRY STEPHENS, F R S, of Edinburg, author of the "*Book of the Form*," &c. &c.; assisted by JOHN P. NORTON, M. A., New Haven, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College, &c., &c.

This highly valuable work will comprise two large royal octavo volumes, containing over 1400 pages, with 18 or 20 splendid steel engravings, and more than 600 engravings on wood, in the highest style of the art, illustrating almost every implement of husbandry now in use by the best farmers, the best methods of ploughing, planting, haying, harvesting, &c. &c., the various domestic animals in their highest perfection; in short, the *pictorial* feature of the book is unique, and will render it of incalculable value to the student of agriculture.

The work is being published in Semi-monthly Numbers, of 64 pages each, exclusive of the Steel engravings, and, when not taken in connection with the Reviews or Blackwood, is sold at 25 Cents each, or $5 for the entire work in numbers, of which there will be at least twenty-two:

The British Periodicals Re-published are as follows, viz.:

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW (Conserv'e),
THE EDINGBURG REVIEW (Whig),
THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW (Free-Church),
THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW (Liberal), and
BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE (Tory)

TERMS AND PREMIUMS.

[See list of Premium Volumes below.]				Per ann.
For any 1 of the four Reviews and	1	Prem.	vol.	$3.00
For any 2 do	" 1	"	"	5.00
For any 3 do	" 2	"	"	7.00
For all four of the Reviews,	" 2	"	"	8.00
For Blackwood's Magazine,	" 1	"	"	3.00
For Blackwood and 3 Reviews,	" 3	"	"	9.00
For Blackwood and 4 Reviews,	" 3	"	"	10.00
For Farmer's Guide (22 Nos.)	" 1	"	"	5.00
" do 1 Rev'w or Black.	" 1	"	"	7.00
" do any 2 Reprints	" 2	"	"	9.00
" do " 3 "	" 2	"	"	11.00
" do " 4 "	" 3	"	"	13.00
" do and all 5 "	" 3	"	"	14.09

(Payments to be made in all cases in Advance.)

[PREMIUM VOLUMES.]

FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW (comprising 1 year).
BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE (6 months).
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW (1 year).
BENTLEY'S MISCELLANY (6 months).
EDINBURGH REVIEW (1 year).
METROPOLITAN MAGAZINE (6 months).
WESTMINSTER REVIEW (1 year).

☞ Remittances and communications should be always addressed, post-paid or franked, to the Publishers. LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,
79 FULTON STREET, New York,
d12 Entrance 54 Gold St

Liberty Bell for 1851.

A FEW COPIES FOR SALE,
At this Office. f 13.

Miscellany.

TULIPOMANIA.

About the year 1634, a very remarkable mania broke out in Holland for buying and selling tulips, or more properly tulip roots. The cultivation of tulips had been carried to a high pitch in Holland, where the fineness of the soil and the climate, along with great personal care, conspire to bring the tulip to perfection. Holland, therefore, had become the great centre of the tulip trade. Roots were exported thence to all parts of the world, and at prices varying according to the state of the market, and other circumstances.

In the above year, a factitious demand arose for tulips. People began to find, that by buying up particular sorts, they could dispose of them at very high prices. In the hope, however, of getting higher prices still, others bought and sold them again at a profit. Thus the trade of buying and selling over again at an advance became universal, and seemed to be without any assignable limit. The prices paid for the roots were generally regulated by weight; and a small weight called a perit, less than a grain, was employed for this purpose. The mania, therefore, took the direction of *perits* instead of *shares*, and that was all the real difference between the tulip and the joint-stock share mania. A seller would say he held four hundred perits of a certain tulip, and another would be heard asking for five hundred perits of a certain other tulip. With this preliminary explanation, we present an account of the Tulipomania from Beckmann's "History of Inventions."

"Tulips, which are of no further use than to ornament gardens, which are exceeded in beauty by many other plants, and whose duration is short and very precarious, became, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the object of a trade such as is not to be met with in the history of commerce, and by which their price rose above that of the most precious metal. An account of this trade has been given by many authors; but by all late ones it has been misrepresented. People laugh at the Tulipomania, because they believe that the beauty and rarity of the flowers induced florists to give such extravagant prices: they imagine that the tulips were purchased so excessively dear in order to ornament gardens; but this supposition is false, as I shall presently show.

"This trade was not carried on throughout all Europe, but in some cities of the Netherlands, particularly Amsterdam, Harlem, Utrecht, Alkamaar, Leyden, Rotterdam, Hoorn, Enkhuysen, and Meedemblick, and rose to the greatest height in the years 1634–1637. Munting has given, from some of the books kept during that trade, a few of the prices then paid, of which I shall present the reader with the following. For a root of that species called the Viceroy, the after mentioned articles, valued as below expressed, were agreed to be delivered: 2 lasts of wheat, 448 florins; 4 ditto rye, 558 florins; 4 fat oxen, 480 florins; 2 hogsheads of wine, 70 florins; 4 tuns of beer, 32 florins; 2 ditto butter, 192 florins; 1000 pounds of cheese, 120 florins; a complete bed, 100 florins; a suit of clothes, 80 florins; a silver beaker, 60 florins; total, 2500 florins.

"These tulips afterwards were sold according to to the weight of the roots. Four hundred perits of Admiral Leifken cost 4400 florins; 446 ditto of Admiral Von der Eyk, 1640 florins; 106 perits Schilder cost 1615 florins; 220 ditto Semper Augustus, 5500 florins; 410 ditto Viceroy, 3000 florins, &c. The species Semper Augustus has been often sold for 2000 florins; and it once happened that there were only two roots of it to be had—the one at Amsterdam, and the other at Harlem. For a root of this species, one agreed to give 4600 florins, together with a new carriage, two gray horses, and a complete harness. Another agreed to give for a root twelve acres of land; for those who had not ready money, promised their movable and immovable goods, houses and lands, cattle and clothes. A man, whose name Munting once knew, but could not recollect, won by this trade more than 60,000 florins in the course of four months. It was followed not only by mercantile people, but also by the first noblemen, citizens of every description, mechanics, seamen, farmers, turf-diggers, chimney-sweeps, footmen, maid-servants, and the old clothes-women, &c. At first, every one won, and no one lost. Some of the poorest people gained in a few months houses, coaches and horses, and figured away like the first characters in the land. In every town some tavern was selected, which served as a 'Change, were high and low traded in flowers, and confirmed their bargains with the most sumptuous entertainments. They formed laws for themselves, and had their notaries and clerks.

"During the time of the Tulipomania, a speculator often offered and paid large sums for a root which he never received, and never wished to receive. Another sold roots which he never possessed or delivered. Oft did a nobleman purchase of a chimney-sweep tulips to the amount of 200 florins, and sell them at the same time to a farmer; and neither the nobleman, chimney-sweep, or farmer, had roots in their possession, or wished to possess them. Before the tulip season was over, more roots were sold and purchased, bespoke and promised to be delivered, than in all probability were to be found in the gardens of Holland; and when Semper Augustus was not to be had, which happened twice, no species perhaps was oftener purchased and sold. In the space of three years, as Munting tells us, more than ten millions were expended in this trade in only one town of Holland.

"To understand this gamblimg traffic, it may be necessary to make the following supposition. A nobleman bespoke of a merchant a tulip-root, to be delivered in six month, at the price of 1000 florins. During these six months, the price of that species of tulip must have risen or fallen, or remained as it was. We shall suppose that at the expiration of that time the price was 1500 florins; in that case the nobleman did not wish to have the tulip, and the merchant paid him 500 florins which the latter lost and the former won. If the price was fallen wheh the six months were expired, so that a root could be purchased at 800 florins, the nobleman then paid to the merchant 200 florins, which he received as so much gain; but if the price continued the same, that is 1000 florins, neither party ganied nor lost. In all these circumstances, however, no one ever thought of delivering the roots or of receiving them.

"Henry Munting, in 1636, sold to a merchant at Alkmaar a tulip-root for 7000 florins, to be delivered in six months; but as the price during that time had fallen, the merchant paid, according to agreement, only 10 per cent. 'So that my father,' says the son, 'received 700 florins for nothing; but he would much rather have delivered the root itself for 7090.' The term of these contracts was often much shorter, and on that account the trade became brisker. In proportion as more gained by this traffic, more engaged in it; and those who had money to pay to one, had soon money to receive of another; as at faro, one loses upon one card, and at the same time wins on another. The tulip-dealers often discounted sums also, and transferred their debts to one another; so that large sums were paid without cash, without bills, and without goods, as by the *Virements* at Lyons.

"The whole of this trade was a game at hazard, as the Mississippi trade was afterwards, and as stock jobbing is at present. The only difference between the tulip trade and stock-jobbing is, that at the end of the contract the price in the latter is determined by the Stock exchange; whereas in the former, it was determined by that at which most bargains were made. High and low priced kinds of tulips were procured, in order that both the rich and the poor might gamble with them; and the roots were weighed by perits, that an imagined whole might be divided, and that people might not only have whole, but half and quarter lots. Whoever is surprised that such a traffic should become general, need only to reflect upon what is done where lotteries are established, by which trades are often neglected, and even abandoned, because a speedier mode of getting fortunes is pointed out to the lower classes. In short, the tulip trade may very well serve to explain stock-jobbing, of which so much is written in gazettes, and of which so many talk in company without understanding it; and I hope, on that account, I shall be forgiven for employing so much time in illustrating what I should otherwise have considered as below my notice.

"At length, however, this trade fell all of a sudden. Among such a number of contracts many were broken; many had engaged to pay more than they were able; the whole stock of the adventurers was consumed by the extravagance of the winners; new adventurers no more engaged in it; and many, becoming sensible of the odious traffic in which they had been concerned, returned to their former occupations. By these means, as the value of tulips still fell, and never rose, the sellers wished to deliver the roots *in natura* to the purchasers at the prices agreed on; but as the latter had no desire for tulips at even such a low rate, they refused to take them or to pay for them. To end this dispute, the tulip-dealers of Alkmaar sent, in the year 1637, deputies to Amsterdam; and a resolution was passed on the 24th of February, that all contracts made prior to the last of November, 1636, should be null and void; and that, in those made after that date, purchasers should be free on paying 10 per cent to the vender.

"The more people became disgusted with this trade, the more did complaints increase to the magistrates of the different towns; but as the courts there would take no cognzance of it, the complainants applied to the states of Holland and West Friesland. These referred the business to the determination of the provincial council at the Hague, which, on the 27th of April, 1637, declared that it would not deliver its opinion on this traffic until it had received more information on the subject; that in the meantime every vender should offer his tulips to the purchaser; and, in case he refused to receive them, the vender should either keep them, or sell them to another, and have recourse on the purchaser for any loss he might sustain. It was ordered also, that all contracts should remain in force till further inquiry was made. But as no one could foresee what judgment would be given respecting the validity of each contract, the buyers were more obstinate in refusing payment than before; and venders, thinking it much safer to accommodate matters amicably, were at length satisfied with a small profit instead of exorbitant gain; and thus ended this extraordinary traffic, or rather gambling."
—*Chambers' Miscellany.*

THE CHARLES THE SECOND BALL.

Since the annonncement of the Costume Ball, a good deal of excitement has been prevalent about the Court regarding it. It is known that Charles the Second used to feed ducks in St. James' Park, and it is thought that this amusement of the Merry Monarch is harmless, and may be repeated on the present festive occasion. Rewards have been offered at the Lord Chamberlain's Office, for a means of keeping the ducks awake till twelve o'clock at night.

We hear that some Duchesses decline altogether to assume the characters of their namesakes in the time of Charles the Second; and that the Dukes, their husbands, perfectly agree in this spirited decision.

For the same reason as their Graces', the parts of Maids of Honor are not in much request. But for the character of Catharine Hyde, who married the heir to the throne, there are numberless proposals among the young ladies of the polite world.

For the character of the Duke of Buckingham (of Charles the Second's time), who kicked down a grand fortune without being able to account for it, we hear a great number of noblemen named; among others, Lord Addlestone, Lord Muddehead, and the Lord Viscount Wildgoose.

The young gentlemen about Downing Street are reading the *Biographie Universelle*, and acquiring a surprising fund of historical knowledge. Young Tapely, old Tapley's son, who is eighteen, and has just entered the Foreign Office, proposes to appear as Colbert; whom Guttleton admires, not as a minister, but as inventor of Colbert-soles. Vander Souchey, of the Duch Legation, announced at the Club that he would go as the Pensionary de Witt. "Behold the miracle instead of de witt," said Flicfiac; and added, that Count Narcissi (the envoy from Pumpernickel) had best assume this character, because the women are always tearing him to pieces.

General the Earl of Slowgo (who does his best to be an F. M.) has just been credibly informed that a work exists—a remarkable work—although a light work he may almost say a biographical work—relative to the times of Charles the Second, called Pepy's *Diary*, and purporting to be edited by a member of their Lordships' House, the Lord Viscount Braybrook.

General Slowgo has, therefore, presented his compliments to Lord Viscount Braybook, and requests to know if the Viscount has edited the work in question? Should his lordship's reply be in the affirmative, General Lord Slowgo will write to the Librarian of the British Museum, to know: 1st, Whether the work, entitled Pepy's *Memoirs*, be in the Library of the British Museum? 2d, Whether that work contains an authentic account of the reign of his late Majesty, King Charles the Second? 3d, Whether the Librarian of the British Museum can bring the volume, if a rare one, to Slowgo House? and, 4th. If not, whether, and at what time, General the Earl of Slowgo can consult the work in question at the British Museum?

The two little Miss Budds (who go about with Lady Crabb) have had another contemporary work lent to them by their cousin Rowley, and are busy reading Grammont's *Memoirs*. When Lady Crabb heard that her wards were reading history, she was highly pleased, and observed that she has no doubt that the volume is instructive, as the family of Grammont is one of the highest in France. The Miss Budds say the book is—very instructive.

Miss Grigg, who is exceedingly curious in books and an iquarianism, has come upon some surprising illustrative passages in her Papa's library, in the works of Wycherly and Sir C. Sedley, and in Suckling's poems.

Colonel Sir Nigel M'Asser, who has the largest and blackest whiskers not only in the Horse Guards Green, but (with the exception of one sapper, now at the Cape of Good Hope) in the British army, when he heard that whiskers were not worn in the time of Charles the Second, and that gentlemen would be expected to shave, instantly applied for leave of absence; and, if that is refused, will send in his papers.

Lady Rosa Twentystone and her daughters have been to Hampton Court, and taken careful note of the Lelys there. But when they came down to dinner in the dresses which they had prepared, and rehearsed the part before Mr. Twentystone, he ordered the whole family up to their rooms, and the dinner to be covered, until they were.

"Lady Rosa is so delightful," Varges says, that he thinks "one can't see too much of her."

Lord Viscount Methuselah has put himself into the hands of new artists, and will appear with the cheeks, hair, and teeth of twenty. He has selected the character of Lord Rochester, and has sent a request to the Lord Chamberlain that he may be allowed to make his *entree* into the ball through a window and up a rope ladder.

Lord Hulkington hopes to be able to get into a page's dress, which he wore once in private theatricals, at the Princess of Wales' Court at Naples, in 1814; and the ladies of his family are busy (for his lordship, since he came into his fortune, is become very economical) in trying to enlarge it.

Lady Howlbury expects to make a great sensation, and not at a large expense; having attired herself and daughters, each in a curtain of the state bed at Ivybush, under which Charles the Second passed three days after the battle of Worcester.

If the Lord Mayor is invited with his suite, the City Marshal, of course, will go as Marshal Tureen.

Lord Tom Noddington was much surprized when he heard that Charles the Second had been up a tree; and always thought that he ran for the Oaks. His opinion was that Charles the Second had had his head cut off just before his son, James the First, came into this country, from Scotland—where Lord Tom goes shooting every year. Mr. Bland Varges, who is the most notorious wag at Spratt's, said, that as Tom Noddington had no head himself, he had better go as the Marquis of Montrose—after his decapitation. Tom Noddington said he would be hanged if he went as Montrose, which Varges said was more and more in character. Lord Tom said he didn't know. He knew that he had shot the Duke's country, and hoped to shoot there again; and he thought "it was devilish dangerous, begad, in those confounded levelling times, by Jove, for fellas to go about, saying that other fellas had their heads cut off; and that sort of thing, begad, might put bad ideas into other fellas' heads, and radical fellas, and dam republican fellas." Mr. Varges said that Lord Tom needn't be afraid about *his* head, and that if he lost it he wouldn't miss it; on which Tom Noddy said that Varges was always chaffing him.

Lord Addlestone—when his librarian informed him that he had heard that Louis the Fourteenth as a young man wore a periwig powdered with gold dust—has hit upon a brilliant thought of his own, and ordered that his wig shall not only be powdered with gold, but that he will have a papillote of bank notes.

If these are scarce, as his steward informs him, his Lordship's man is directed to use promissory notes bearing his Lordship's valuable signature.

The young officers of the Eclectic Regiments, horse and foot, Cornets and Lieutenant-Captains with ten shillings per diem of pay, are greatly gratified at the idea of having to pay £40 a piece for their wigs at the Ball.

It is said that a venerable Prelate of a Western Diocese is going to represent all the seven recusant Bishops of James' time at once; and Cardinal de Retz, who had a genius for conspiracies, fights, rows, and hot water in general, has a representative in Golden Square, with a hat and costume ready bought and paid for.

Ensign and Lieutenant Tipton of the Coolstreams says that he intends to take Marlborough's part as a young man, for he is very good-looking, is as poor as a rat, and ready to borrow money of any woman who will lend it.—*Punch.*

DEATH OF THE MARTYR.

The following letter, giving an account of the death of the famous martyr, Belthazar Gerard, for the assassination of William of Nassau, the Prince of Orange, the constant enemy of the Holy Catholic Church, proves to a remarkable degree the height to which fanatical excitement will carry mankind during times of civil discord and religious disturbances. Before quoting the letter, we must premise that in the year 1580, Alessan dro Farnese, the Prince of Parma, who succeeded Don John of Austria in the Government of the Netherlands, had taken Courtray; Tournay in 1581, and Oudenarde in 1582. All this had been done with the Walloon troops alone. After the conquest of Portugal by Phillip II., the Spanish veterans who had been previously removed, were again brought back to the Low Countries; and their presence speedily brought matters to a crisis. In 1583, Bunkirk was taken by storm; and shortly afterwards Nieuport and all the coast of the Netherlands, as far as Ostend, Dixmunde and Furnes was lost by the insurgents. The towns of Ypres, Bruges and Ghent surrendered to the Spanish veterans. With regard to all political matters the Spaniards were exceedingly forbearing, but in ecclesiastical affairs—wherever the interests of the Church were concerned—these men were inexorable. Brussels soon fell into the power of the Prince of Parma, who then prepared to besiege the important town of Antwerp. All men's eyes in the Low Countries were turned towards the Prince of Orange, as the only leader from whom they could expect relief in these times of oppression: while the Spaniards on the other hand thought nothing accomplished so long as the arch enemy of their religion—who had, moreover, promised to relieve Antwerp—still lived; he alone was capable of sustaining the sinking fortunes of the Protestant insurgents. Meanwhile an exorbitant price had been set upon his head by the Spanish government. This, in conjunction with religious zeal, had already caused several fanatics to make repeated attempts upon the prince's life. "I know," says Ranke, in his history of the Popes, "of no greater blasphemy than that contained in the papers of the Biscavan Jaurequy, who was seized in an attempt on the life of the Prince. He wore, as a sort of amulet, prayers in which the merciful Godhead, which had manifested itself to man in the person of Christ, was invoked to favor murder." A share of the price of blood was promised to the divine persons; to the mother of God, a crown; to Jesus, a curtain or veil. Jaurequy was seized and executed; but, almost at the moment of his execution, another assassin was on his way to carry out the execrable project, in the which he succeeded but too well.

Balthazar Gerard, a Burgundian by birth, had heard the sentence of outlawry pronounced against Jaurequy in Maestricht, and a strong desire of earning the crown of martyrdom, increased by the encouragement he received from a Jesuit of Treves, urged him to commit the deed. We learn from Catholic sources that "he was a youth of eight-and-twenty, learned and eloquent," and that for seven years and a half he had entertained this project.

The Spanish writer from whom the following narrative is translated, shall now tell the story of Balthazar Gerard in his own way. It is difficult to say which is most to be deplored, the fanaticism which could urge a man to commit such a crime, or the revengeful feelings which could induce others to subject a fellow-creature to such tortures. The stoic fortitude displayed by the wretched fanatic was worthy of a better cause. The letter thus proceeds:

"Christ our Lord is he who conquers in all martyrs, and in him do they put their trust in obtaining all things. He hath promised to give them knowledge and power of speech, and they confess themselves and are thankful to have thus received whatsoever be necessary to give answer to barbarians and infidels.

"Balthazar Gerard, of Besancon, a Burgundian by birth, and apparently about eight-and-twenty years of age, a youth of an excellent education, eloquent, and endowed with remarkable prudence and ability, did, at half-past twelve, on the tenth of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand five hundred and eighty-four, perform a most famous and notable action, the which he had long meditated, and had made a vow to accomplish. He commenced it without delay, and performed it with success. This brave youth—considering for many years the perfidy and obstinacy of William of Nassau, the Prince of Orange, who, under the pretence of freedom and liberty, hath deprived so many souls of all hopes of eternity, and their bodies of all temporalities, and of the blessings of fortune—determined to place himself in imminent peril of his life. For much time, for the space of six or seven years, he waited until God should aid him in his divine will; and looking well to the business in hand, he worked hard to carry it into execution against one who was a breaker of his plighted work, a traitor and a rebel to his prince, who had condemned him as such. Accordingly, when an occasion offered itself to convey a letter to the Prince of Orange, announcing the death of the Duke of Alencon, Balthazar Gerard seized upon it. He was received by the prince's suite at half-past twelve o'clock on the tenth of July, and immediately discharged an arquebuss upon the Prince of Orange, as the latter rose from table. The arquebuss was loaded with three bullets, which struck the prince close to the heart, two inches below the nipple of the left breast, and killed him instantly. And as the prince fell to the ground the Burgundian fled, but was immediately captured close to the walls of the city. He retained to the last moment of his life the most extraordinary ease and presence of mind, and answered all the questions which were asked of him with the greatest prudence and freedom. The first thing he did was to account for his action to the governors of the town, and this he did with cogent reasons, in a clear and beautiful style, saying that he had performed a most excellent service for God, to his king, and to the Christian public. He gave up his body to the torture, which he knew awaited him; and after this he said—'I have now done my part; do you now perform what appeareth to belong to your office. Let the torture chamber be prepared, for I have no wish to detain you any longer.'

"That first night he was cruelly scourged with rods five several times, and his body was then anointed with honey, when a he-goat was brought, which with his rough, prickly tongue, should have licked his torn flesh and skin: but the goat would not approach him. After this he was placed in the torture chamber, and tormented in various ways. He was stretched out on the rack, and on the ladder, and was then tormented in various ways to prevent him from sleeping. Likewise, on the following days and nights, he was rigorously tortured with every possible cruelty, and being placed on the instrument of torture called the wooden horse, as much as one hundred and forty pounds' weight attached to his great toe. After this, shoes made of new and untanned leather were placed on his feet, the shoes having been previously smeared with oil. He was then stripped and his body anointed all over with soap or butter, and he was placed near a large fire. Although his body was torn and lacerated with the stripes, and the hollow of his arm-pits and his sides were burned with a hot iron, they did place on him a shirt in dipped brandy, which they set on fire, and did likewise insert pins and needles between the nails of his toes and fingers. As he gave no signs of pain, they did now shave off all his hair, and did wash his body with the filthy rinsings of water. They did then put upon him a garment taken from the filthy rinsings of water. They did then put upon him a garment taken from some sick man in the hospital—others say it belonged to a sorcerer or a witch—thinking that in this manner they would break the enchantment by which they surmised he warded off feeling the torture. But all these inventions failed, and, in answer to their manifold questions how he managed to endure these excruciating torments, he replied, 'By God and patience!'

"When asked how it was that he neither moved a muscle, nor gave any sign of feeling these various torments, he said that, 'The prayers of the blessed produced in him this constancy and long-suffering.' He said to the consul, who wondered at seeing this constancy, 'In death constancy will make itself evident.' Excepting during the time when he was tortured, he did talk with much gentleness, ease, and modesty, so much so that the very executioners, and those who assisted at the torture, were much amazed, and the standers-by were moved even unto tears.—Some did say he was not a man, while others did much envy his excellent virtues; but they who do not much believe in Christ Jesus, nor in his holy gospel, imitating the Infidel Jews, asked him 'How long it was since he had commended his soul to Satan?' To these he replied with the greatest modesty, that 'He had never had any dealings with, or knowledge of, the devil.' He answered and defended himself in the same manner when the people called him traitor, and the murderer of the father of his country, together with other odious appellations; and this was not done once, but frequently; in such cases he bore all these calumnies and reproaches with exceeding great modesty and downcast eyes. He always gave answers unto the judges with gentleness and perfect freedom, and, what was more extraordinary, he gave them thanks in that they had sent him food and drink while he was in prison, telling them that he would repay them these kindnesses. And when he was asked in what manner he intended to pay them, he replied, 'By praying for them, and by being their advocate in heaven.'

"On the 17th of the same month of July, he was informed of the certainty of his approaching death, and on the following day the sentence was read to him, the which he heard with great peace and contentment, saying, with the most holy Cyprian,—'Thanks be to God.' And then, with signs of nothing but virtue, with a firm and constant heart, with a high color in his cheek, and clear bright eyes, with his feet broken, lacerated and burnt, and his fingers distorted, he entered the plaza, or amphitheatre, where he was to suffer death. He allowed himself to be tied to the stake in the torm of a cross, and showed no wavering, no sign of terror, in the sight of all the tortures, the memory whereof is alone sufficient to cause great terror and emotion; but he bore them all without flinching, in the presence of the whole city, in the same manner in which he endured his past sufferings, and his blood has sanctified us and our country, sowing the seeds for future martyrs. Because, as tyrants and persecutors of the Church are unable to root out the seed of the martyrs, which is Christ, they do many times cut down the branches and offshots which they see growing, not-seeing, short-sighted mortals as they are, that by pruning they increase their growth.'

"Gerard was then tied to the stake where he was to suffer death, and the executioners, with some trouble, and before his face, broke in pieces the arquebuss wherewith he hath done this famous deed; nevertheless, he showed no sign of emotion. And while he was transported in prayer they undressed him and applied burning bits of wood to his flesh, the smell of which did pervade the whole plaza. After this the executioners took some strong pincers, with which they now seized a piece of red-hot iron, which they applied to the muscles of his arms and legs; and while they were thus burning and torturing him he continued steadfast in prayer, and never changed color, nor did he move hand or foot, excepting that he raised his right hand and made the sign of the cross on his forehead with great reverence. After he was released from the stake, he did himself put on his clothes, and walked, as well as he was able, to the station assigned to him. The executioners then cruelly mutilated his body, and little by little cut a hole, in the form of a cross, in his belly, and extracted his entrails and his heart, the which were thrown on one side; meanwhile his lips never ceased praying. And, as if his mouth could only speak what was virtuous, he never uttered a complaint, and thus with a color always in his cheek, this great and excellent martyr, who must become the patron saint of his country, breathed his last, in the hopes of an immortal and glorious triumph, on the 14th July, being the Saturday before the eighth Sunday after Pentecost, half an hour before midday, on the self same day in which I am now inditing this letter.

"His head was afterwards cut off and placed on the point of a lance before it was exposed on the walls of the city, where it appears more beautiful than many heads of living men. The body, cut into four quarters, was likewise stuck on four poles, and placed over the four principal gates of the city."

Thus ends this contemporary letter, which we have extracted from Spanish documents lately published in Madrid. But to show more fully the different modes in which crimes are viewed, when the passions of parties are in a state of fierce excitement, while Gerard was thus expiating his guilt at Delfit, and expiring amid the curses of the people, the carons of Herzogenbusch, were celebrating his achievement with a solemn Te Deum!—*Bentley's Miscellany.*

ORIGINAL LETTER OF DR. FR ANKLIN.

The following letter was brought to light by the London correspondent of the *Boston Post*. In communicating it to that journal he says: "It is copied verbatim, et literatim, spelling, punctuation, capitals and all—and as near a fac simile as my writing could make it—just as it stands in the original. I have reason to suppose it has never before been published:"

Philadelphia, March 1, 1775.

Sir—I am but just returned from a long Journey, after near 6 Months Absence and find your Fav. of Sept. 29, by which I have the agreeable Advice that you expect to be able to remit me something in Smith's Affairs very soon.

As to the Thickness of Wire necessary or sufficient to conduct a large Quantity of Lightning, concerning which you desire my Sentiments, you will find something on that Head, in Pages 124, and 125, of the enclos'd Pamphlet, which please to accept. And I may add, that in my late Journey I saw an Instance of a very great Quantity of Lightning conducted by a Wire no bigger than a common knitting Needle. It was at Newbury, in England, where the Spire of the Church Steeple being 70 feet in height above the belfry was split all to pieces and thrown about the Street in Fragment; from the Bell down to the Clock, placed in the Steeple 20 foot below the Bell, there was the small Wire above mentioned which communicated the Motion of the Clock to the Hammer striking the Hour on the Bell. As far as the wire, extended, no Part of the Steeple was hurt by the Lightning, nor below the Clock as far as the Pendulum Rod reached; but from the end of the Rod, downwards the Lightning rent the Steeple surprisingly. The Pendulum Rod was about the thickness of a small Tobacco Pipe Stem, and conducted the whole without damage to its own Substanc, except that the End where the Lightning was accumulated, it appeared melted as much as made a small Drop. But the Clock wire was blown all to smoke, and smutted the church wall which it passed in a broad black Track, and also the Ceiling under which it was carried horizontally. No more of it was left than about an Inch and a half next the Tail of the Hammer, and as much joining to the Clock. Yet this is observable that tho' it was so small as not to be sufficient to conduct the Quantity with Safety to its own Substance, yet it did conduct, so as to secure all that Part of the Building. Excuse this Scrawl, which I have not time to copy fair.

I am, with much Respect, Sir,
Your very humble Servant,
B. Franklin.

P. S. I have just been reading a similar instance taken from the Journal des Scavans, for 1676, page 113—viz "En 1676 le tonnere ecrasa le clocker de "l'Abbage d Sains Medard de Soissons; la fondre se "ports a une grande Distance le long des fils d'as-"chal qui communiquoient a l'horloge; elle fondit "ces cordes metalligues sans faire d'autres desordres "dans tout le trajet."

NAPOLEON AND JOSEPHINE.

Napoleon's acquaintance with Josephine arose from the impression made on him by her son Eugene Beauharnais, then a little boy. He came to request that his father's sword, which had been delivered up, might be restored to him. The boy's appearance—the earnestness with which he urged his request, and the tears which could not be stayed when he beheld the sword, interested Napoleon so much in his favor that not only was the sword given to him, but he determined to become acquainted with the mother of the boy. He visited her, and soon his visits became frequent. He delighted to hear the details which she gave of the court of Louis.

"Come," he would say, as he sat by her side of an evening, "now let us us talk of the old court—let us make a tour to Versailles." It was in these frequent and familiar interviews that the fascinations of Josephine won the heart of Napoleon. "She is," said he, "grace personified—everything she does is with a grace and delicacy perculiar to herself."

The admiration and love of such a man could not fail to make an impression on a woman like Josephine. It has been said, that it was impossible to be in Napoleon's company without being struck by his personal appearance; not so much by the exquisite symmetry of his features, and the noble head and forehead, which have furnished the painter and the sculptor with one of their finest models; nor even by the meditative look, so indicative of intellectual power; but the magic charm was the varying expression of countenance, which changed with every passing thought, and glowed with every feeling. His smile, it is said, always inspired confidence. "It is difficult, if not impossible," so the Duchess of Abrantes writes, "to describe the charm of his countenance when he smiled—his soul was upon his lips and in his eyes." The magic power of that expression at a later period is well known. The Emperor of Russia experienced it when he said, "I never loved any one more than that man." He possessed, too, that greatest of all charms, an harmonious voice, whose tones, like his countenance, changing from emphatic impressiveness to caressing softness, found their way to every heart. It may not have been those personal and mental gifts alone which won Josephine's heart; the ready sympathy with which Napoleon entered into her feelings may have been the greatest charm to an affectionate nature like hers.

It was in the course of one of those confidential evenings that, as they sat together, she read to him the last letter which she had received from her husband: it was a most touching farewell. Napoleon was deeply affected; and it has been said that that letter, and Josephine's emotion as she read it, had a powerful effect upon his feelings, already so much excited by admiration.—*Fraser's Magazine.*

MAN'S SPHERE.

At the Woman's Rights Convention, recently held at Akron, Ohio, Mrs. Coe, a well-known and able lecturer on the subject in that State, thus graphically defined the sphere in which man moves, and which, of course, woman must not invade:

Something has been said of the different spheres in which the sexes are to move, and I am glad for once to hear an attempt made in the resolutions of Mrs. S. to limit that of man. I have always heard that he had a sphere, but no one before, I believe, has ever thought of prescribing bounds to it. His sphere has hitherto been all over creation, and it by any Yankee invention he could contrive to get means to get out of it, it would be perfectly legitimate (laughter). He may not only engage in the most noble, but wherever there is a copper to be turned, may descend to the most common and ignoble pursuits, without encroaching in the least on the boundaries of the sphere of any other being.

He may not only study and practice the professions, engage in extensive manufactories and mercantile enterprizes, but it is considered perfectly legitimate for him to descend to the minutest details of a lady's toilet. He may sell hair-pins, combs, brushes, thread, needles, breast-pins, ear and finger-rings, doll-babies, with all the *et ceteras* of a child's play-house, gingerbread, beer by the glass, and even sugar candy by the penny's worth, if there is any money to be made from it (laughter); and it has nor inaptly been said of him, that if he were to have a life's lease of heaven, on condition of being perfectly contented with it, and should hear a sixpence drop on the floor of hell, he would feel an itching palm until he had contrived some means to slip down and pick it up (applause and laughter.) The creed written on his young heart from the moment he leaves his mother's apron string, is

"Go, get your gold, no matter how,
No questions asked of the rich I trow;
Steal by night and steal by day,
Doing it all in a legal way,
Be hypocrite, liar, knave or fool,
But don't be poor (remember the rule);
Dimes and dollars, and dollars and dimes,
An empty pocket is the worst of crimes.

The article which follows we copy from the *London Dispatch*, as the best exposition of a 'Higher Law' that we remember to have seen in all that has been written on that point, in this country, within the last year. It is none the less forcible that it is not intended to bear upon the question that has been agitated here. The author we presume to be the Rev. Mr. Fox, the colleague of Geo. Thompson in the representation of the Tower Hamlets in Parliament:

MENTAL CIVILIZATION.

It was the somewhat startling observation of Niebur, that Plato was a bad citizen. The thought is acute, and one of the very deep significancy. We feel no call to refute the imputation. It sets out upon the principle that the first and centre duty of a member of society is civism. He must measure all his other obligations by those of neighborhood and the state. He must bound his sympathies by his country, if its temporal and political interests require it. He must first ask of every action how it concerns the body politic. He must sacrifice all other desires and principles to the will and the traditions of his people. His mind, habits, feelings, must be distinctive and separatist. Man must be to him a stranger, and hospitably entreated, only because the nation's customs recognized the laws of hospitality. A foreigner must be but his guest, not his fellow creature. His common humanity shall be recognized only through the glory of the State. He himself shall be no longer a man, but a subject, or a citizen, whenever he is a unit in a kingdom, or included in the census of a republic, taking his oath of allegiance, or holding his certificate of naturalization. If it be necessary for the politic interests of his country that he should wink at its injustice—if its apparent temporal power is promoted by bad morality—if all his fellow citizens have agreed upon some enterprize of national aggrandizement or great principles of state policy, it is his duty to join in the common enthusiasm, and second, with life and fortune, the common struggle. The safety of *his* commonwealth must be his supreme law. He must refrain from weakening, by words of truth and soberness, the excitement which seconds the central authority. If his nation be in the wrong, he must at least be silent; if his faults are many, he must never tell them, but still assert that his "fatherland" is "the envy of surrounding nations, and the glory of the world." In this sense Plato was indeed a bad citizen, as well as all are, who refuse "to follow the multitude to do evil." Socrates, too, was no better, and for that it was that he was condemed, by Republican patriotic antipathies, to the lethal hemlock. Aristides heard to an end a cunning scheme of the state, which, if put in act, would have raised its material glory, and added to its power. The "Just" was a bad citizen, because he discouraged the enterprise with the memorable saying, "Nothing can be more politic, and nothing more unjust." The "good citizen" sanctifies the means by the end—calls antipathies patriotism, considers hatred of an enemy a wholesome prejudice, and sanctifies aggression by the plea of national interest. Jesus Christ, on such a principle of political ethics, was a bad citizen—nay, no citizen at all. Love of country is a sentiment nowhere to be found in the New Testament. Patriotism cannot be found among the beatitudes. When Paul, a Hebrew itinerant, uplifted his voice upon Mars Hill, it was to protest against household deities—to explode national tutelars—to *dissillusionate* the Minerva of the Acropolis, as he had done the Diana of Ephesus—and, holding out the right hand of fellowship to the whole human race, to proclaim the Unknown God of the universe—and to declare that he had made of one blood all nations. But this nation appears to be quite of Niebuhr's way of thinking. If we would measure our progress, we must examine our national idea. It is little different from that which ostracized Aristides, which poisoned Socrates, which crucified Christ—which called the French our natural enemies—which hunted the apostles of Reform out of society, to prison, to banishment, to the scaffold—which throws contempt on those apostles of peace who have been welcomed and reverently entreated in every country but their own. We have lost sight of all grand fundamental ideas. It is our boast that we are an eminently practical people, despising abstractions as they are called—which means that we are a people altogether of material ideas, looking only to proximate, never to final, causes. It is even becoming the fashion to ridicule the appeal, "Am not I a man and a brother?" If it is desired to rout a rival, or confound an argument, the remedy is at hand—stigmatize him, or it, as "un-English." If a claim is made upon our justice, we do not suffer our conscience to answer it, but our reverence for tradition—the response is, "we are a Protestant people." If a fellow citizen demands his rights, it suffices to call compliance with them "unconstitutional." If a neighbor pleads "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," the demurrer is considered to justify a nonsuit, "it would unchristianize the character of the State." Such is the mean and sordid standard of our national principles—such the grovelling and utterly material spirit of the national idea. We dare not, indeed, confess it to ourselves, while we every where act upon it. There is no Jesuitical subterfuge to which we will not have recourse—no miserable sophism beneath our use—no forged fallacy we will not attempt to pass into circulation, that we may both have our cake and eat it—both worship Jehovah and bow down in the house of Rimnon—both indulge our Paganism and brazen out our profession of Evangelism. The bluff and honest as well as eminently wise statesman gave us this aphorism for all time—"Whatever is morally wrong, cannot be politically right." What is this nickname "Protestant," that with its shibboleth we should conjure ourselves out of the broad principles of religious liberty? If it is to be made the warrant of oppression, we say, "Down with it!" What is there in the term "Constitution," that it should be the convenient plea for injustice? We can change that, we can subvert it, and the world be never the worse; but justice is unchangeable, and woe be to the people who dare to ignore it in favor of even the highest apparent necessities of patriotism. What is there in the traditions and associations of England, aye, even to an Englishman, that he should blaspheme the mighty interests of the world and of the human race, on behalf of the superior claims of his precious little Peddlington? What is there in the word Christian, that it should detach our allegiance from the inalinable rights of man? Bear with us—we are not "in our heroics." What we say is neither abstract nor transcendental. We touch upon the master idea of practical life. We put the finger upon the plague-spot of our time. In a word, we but give the text of the funeral oration of mighty kingdoms—the diagnosis of the ruins of empires. There are no nicknames in the spirit of the Gospel. "Protestant" is not there. "Christian" is not there—"constitutional" is not there—neither is "Papist," "politic" nor "un-English." Could but the great Teacher stand in our senate-house, as once he did in the temple, and listen to the envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness of which his doctrine is made the plea, could he hear the most oily and unctuous of his Pharisee professors, beating his countrymen from their doors, on the very ground that to be kind and to be just is to insult his name, does not every one who can imagine the scene feel as if the whisper met his ear, "Have I been so long with thee, and hast thou not known me?—has my gospel of peace on earth and good will among men been these eighteen hundred years proclaimed, and is this the commentary, and these the bitter and barren fruits?" Here is a Solicitor-General, who is always a Christian until he remembers that he is a Churchman; when straightway the gall and wormwood of fanaticism strips him of his Catholicity and sends him forth into the world's business a poor forked animal, distinguishable in nothing from a Pharisee but the trailing behind him of a Q. C. legal lappet, in place of a phylactery. There stands a minister, thinking that wisdom and the world lie behind him, in place of before him; perpetually quoting the ignorance and inexperience of the past as the authoritative guide of the present and the future; pleading Catholic precedent for Protestant rule in the persecution of Papists, and resting the maxims of government and legislation upon the "wisdom of our ancestors," and the "ancient laws of this kingdom," in place of the wisdom from above, the eternal principles of truth and justice, and the immutable laws of human nature and social economy. Can we wonder that the master ideas of our age and country should be so low and so sordid, when these are the rules of our statesmanship? Or rather, is it not true that we are a nation *without* any cardinal idea, except perhaps, that "sufficient for the day is the evil thereof," or cash is the sole *nexus* of society. "When we were (nationally) a child, we spoke like a child; we thought as a child." But, if we would "become a man, we must put away childish things." Our "ancient glory"—our "memorable history"—our constitutional traditions—our "venerable institutions"—our British spirit—our laws and customs—were counters which we might play with in our puling infancy—in the time when there was not an English people, but only a suzerain, a lord, and a vassal—when even our statutes against the Pope, never in their preamble mentioned the commonalty, the rights of the people, or of conscience, but only promised and pledged the estates of the realm to "stand by the king, his crown and dignity"—and when "common clamor" was *not* reckoned good Saxon, but naked Latinity, the cant of Norman ecclesiastical lawyers, not the natural utterance of the commonalty. But all this barbarous slang, this substitution of the subterfuge of the phrases of prejudice or national conceit of its own ignorance and folly, for the hard and perdurable realities of life, are now utterly worthless. We must live not as Englismen, but as men, members of the great human family—not by musty Acts of Parliament or paper constitutions, but by the immutable laws of a Universal God—not by crude conceits, which we call our traditionary laws, nor by national prejudices, which we term customs, but by the intuitions of an ever-living conscience, and the eternal rule of right—not by institutions, however venerable, but by truth and justice, which are far older than the creation, and will still be young when this goodly frame of things shall be no more. We must learn to ask of ourselves, not is this or that English? but is it right?—not *is* it law? but *should* it be?—not is it constitutional? but is it wise and true? Here, in the second half of this nineteenth century, has one able and honest citizen asked this Senate of ours to give the people knowledge, and a poor flunkey wiseacre straightway contributes his share of sycophant ignorance to the Belgravian folly, by rebuking Bacon for the aphorism that "knowledge is power." And the Minister who seeks to trample upon the rights of conscience because the Synod of Thurles quashed Irish Colleges on the ground that they did not teach religion, extinguishes Mr. Fox's motion, because Anglican theology is not included in his idea of instruction; and his Home Secretary turns up the whites of his pious eyes, because tuition is proposed to exclude the Thirty-nine Articles; and his Solicitor-General shudders at the thought of a school being segrated from the patristic slang of the Athanasian creed, and adopts the sentiment, scandalous in tho mouth of a fetish negro priest, too bad even for the doctors of the Sorbonne, and worthy only of an Inglis, that "knowledge in itself is an unmixed evil." The knowledge of nature, which leads up to nature's God—of creation, which reminds the most stloid of a Creator—of Science, mind, art, whose harmonious beauty and ineffable wisdom cannot be unfolded to the most degraded, without imparting the harmony they develop, inspiring the reverential awe and solemn wonder which cannot fail to seek after their Author, if haply they might find him, and which, to know and feel, must, unless the learner be "duller than the fat weed that rots itself in ease on Lethe's wharf," makes him who comes even to scoff, "remain to pray." If these "blind leaders of the blind" were not mere parrot theologians, without one atom of religion, they might have remembered who it was who said, "*The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world* ARE CLEARLY SEEN, BEING UNDERSTOOD BY THE THIMGSTHAT ARE MADE, EVEN BY HIS ETERNAL POWER AND GODHEAD." A Ministry praised by Sir R. H. Inglis, and adopting his principles, without believing them, but merely as a factious speculation—what can we say of such an Administration, that it would not be beneath us to utter? Mr. Greg is in the right. It is our creeds that curse us and debase us. The Church must be deleted from our social economy, and her theology exploded, before this nation can be or do any thing. The popular faith is false, mean, pagan. We cannot get figs from thistles. We must receive the "ingrafted word," not the substituted superstition, else we perish. We never were in greater peril than we are now—the peril, at least, was never so clearly visible. Progress is only seen in infidelity and atheism among masses of ignorance. The only faith among us is baseless and bad. The press must prophecy, because the recognized prophets are false.

A PLEA FOR SHORT WOMEN.

I am brief myself; brief in stature brief in discourse, short of memory and money, and far short of my wishes. In most things, too, I am an admirer of brevity; I cannot endure long dinners. All the delicate viands that sea and land, with all the points "on the shipman's card," produce, are not so irresistible a temptation to gluttony as the ennui of a needless half-hour at table: certain motions of the jaws are undoubtedly infectious; such are laughing, yawning and eaten. Should the nightmare, "and her fine fold," descend visibly upon the dishes—should indigestion, after the old fashion, assume the shape of Abernethy to admonish me, and gout appear in the yet more formidable likeness of a racking toe, the mere dead weight of time would turn the balance of my resolves. I am partial to short ladies. Here I shall be told, perhaps, that the Greeks include size in their ideal of beauty; that all Homer's fair ones are "large and comely"; and that Lord Byron has expressed his detestation of "dumpy women." All this is very true; but what is it all to me? Women are not ideals, nor do we love or admire them as such; Homer makes his heroes tall as well as his heroines; there cannot, as Falstaff says, the better sympathy. And as for his Lordship, when I am the Grand Turk he shall choose for me. I revere the sex as much as any man, but I do not like to look up to them. I had rather be consorted "with the youngest wren of nine," than with any daughter of Eve whose morning stature was taller than my evening shadow. Whatever such an Amazon might condescend to say to me, it would sound of "nothing but low and little." Those pretty diminutives, which in all languages are the terms of affection, from her lips would seem like personalties; she could have but one set of phrases for fondness and scorn. If I would "whisper soft nonsense in her ear," I must get on my legs, as if I were going to move a resolution; if in walking I would keep step with her, I must stride as if I were measuring the ground for two duellists, one of whom was my very good friend, and the other a very good shot. Should I dance with her (alas, I am past my dancing days,) I should seem like a cock-boat tossing in a storm, at the stern of a three-decker. And should I wed her; (proh dolor; I am declared by signs infallible an old bachelor elect; cats, the coyest of the breed, leap on my knees; that saucy knave, called the old bachelor, falls eternally to my share, and no soft look of contradiction averts the omen; candles shrink self-extinguished when I would snuff them, and no sweet voice will chide my awkwardness;) but *should* I wed her, I must "stand the push of every beardless vain comparative." The young Etonian jackanapes would call us Elegiacs, (carmen lugubre!) the Cantab pedants would talk of their duplicate ratios; yea, unbreeched urchins, old ale-wives, and coblers in their stalls, would cry out after us, there goes eighteen-pence; and prudential punsters would wish the match might prove happy, but it was certainly very *unequal.*—*Hartley Coleridge.*